DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 182 548 CE 024 167

AUTHOR Baker, Joan W.; Benner, Susan M.
TITLE Project to Mainstream Gifted Handicapped Students into Selected Models of the Executive High School Internships Program: Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Teachers College.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 1 Aug 78
GRANT G0077C0059
NOTE 147p.; Parts of the appendix may not reproduce well due to light and broken type

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Exploration; Community Involvement; *Experiential Learning; *Gifted; *Handicapped Students; High School Students; Mainstreaming; Managerial Occupations; Participant Satisfaction; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Executive High School Internships Program

ABSTRACT

As a supplement to the standard in-school high school curriculum, the Executive High School Internship Program provides experiential learning opportunities for gifted high school students. The program focuses on management-level field placements through which participants learn to make decisions, interact with the world-of-work, and assume responsbility for their actions. In 1977 a pilot project was conducted to mainstream gifted handicapped students into the on-going internship programs. Eight school districts (twelve students) participated in the one-semester demonstration pilot. Assessment focused on its effects on students, sponsors, coordinators and school personnel. General program characteristics were examined to determine feasibility of program expansion. Learner outcomes and process objectives were outlined by program participants and formed the base of the evaluation. Pre- and post-test instruments were used in combination with on-site visits to participating districts. Based on evaluation results, it was concluded with the exception of one internship the mainstreaming project was successful. Handicapped interns were able to compete successfully with non-handicapped peers in independent world-of-work situations. In addition, handicapped students were able to integrate fully into the seminar setting. Only one of the site sponsors expressed reluctance to work with a handicapped intern in the future. Several sponsors expressed the desire to see the program extended. (BM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED182548

PROJECT TO MAINSTREAM GIFTED HANDICAPPED STUDENTS INTO SELECTED MODELS OF THE EXECUTIVE HIGH SCHOOL INTERNSHIPS PROGRAM: EVALUATION REPORT

Prepared by

Joan W. Baken, Ed.D.
Susan M. Benner

August 1, 1978

CE024167

Frances P. Connor
Chairman
Department of Special Education
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2
Plenary-Training Workshop	2
On-Site Visit - Buffalo, New York	11
On-Site Visit - Des Moines, Iowa	18
On-Site Visit - Springfield, Illinois	25
On-Site Visit - Sacramento, California	30
On-Site Visit - Compton, California	37
On-Site Visit - New York, New York	42
On-Site Visit - Orlando and Palm Beach, Florida	51
Debriefing Conference - Kansas City, Missouri	53
SUMMARY OF RESULTS	58
RECOMMENDATIONS	70
APPENDIX A: Plenary-Training Workshop Follow-Up	74
APPENDIX B: Selection Criteria and Objectives	76
APPENDIX C: Evaluation Design	80
EVALUATION PACKET SENT TO COORDINATORS	82
SITE VISIT GUIDE	130
DEBRIEFING CONFERENCE - FOLLOW-UP	133

PROJECT TO MAINSTREAM GIFTED HANDICAPPED STUDENTS INTO SELECTED MODELS OF THE EXECUTIVE HIGH SCHOOL INTERNSHIPS PROGRAM: EVALUATION

INTRODUCTION

Under the provisions of Public Law 91-230, Section 806:

"Gifted and talented children are those identified by professionally qualified persons who by virtue of outstanding abilities are capable of high performance. These are children who require differentiated educational programs and services beyond those normally provided by the regular school program in order to realize their contribution to self and society."

As a supplement to the standard in-school high school curriculum, the Executive High School Internship provides experiential learning opportunities for gifted high school students. The program focuses on management-level field placements through which participants learn to make decisions, interact with the world-of-work, and assume responsibility for their actions. A special aspect of this program was the funding of a pilot project to mainstream gifted handicapped students into the on-going internship programs. Eight school districts participated in the one semester demonstration pilot.

Assessment of the Mainstreaming Project focused on its effects on students, sponsors, coordinators and school personnel. General program characteristics were examined to determine feasibility of program expansion. Learner outcomes and process objectives were outlined by program participants and formed the base of the evaluation. Pre- and post-test instruments were used in combination with on-site visits to participating districts.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

As defined in the proposed request for funds, this special project was intended to mainstream gifted handicapped students into selected models of the Executive High School Internships Program.

At a workshop held in late October 1977, representatives of participating school districts met to outline a series of objectives and processes which would guide the Mainstreaming Project. The following evaluation traces this special program from the initial Plenary-Training Workshop to the end of the one semester pilot project. Data have been gathered from all eight school districts and include on-site interviews with the implementation teams in each district.

Plenary-Training Workshop

From October 27 to 31, 1977, the national office of the Executive High School Internships of America (EHIP) sponsored a plenary-training workshop for those EHIP coordinators who would be participating in the mainstreaming and gifted handicapped projects funded by the United States Office of Education. Also included as workshop participants were special education representatives from those school districts included in the project. Expressed National Office goals for the workshop included reaching consensus on project objectives and processes, clarification of the roles and obligations of implementation of information related to the special needs of the visually, auditorially and orthopedically handicapped.

Initial evaluation of the workshop's goals was based upon on-site

monitoring of the plenary-training sessions and results obtained from a follow-up questionnaire (see Appendix A). A second measure of the consensus reached at the workshop was reflected in the process by which the project was implemented at the local level (i.e., in accordance with the objectives and methods agreed upon at the workshop).

Based upon discussion held during the workshop, the EHIP national office modified the original proposed objectives. The final project goals (see Appendix B) were disseminated to coordinators and were sent to the evaluators on November 25, 1977.

Learner Objectives

In concert, it was agreed that handicapped students would be expected to achieve the same learning outcomes as other students in the program. Two primary objectives were defined as stated below:

1. Gifted handicapped students will achieve an expanded level of self-awareness and personal growth;
2. Gifted handicapped students will demonstrate increased competence in coping with world-of-work situations.

A third objective was developed for non-handicapped students and focused upon their "increased appreciation and level of comfort relating to handicapped students."

On the conference follow-up questionnaire all respondents indicated that learner objectives had been agreed upon by implementation team members. On-site conversations with coordinators and observation of the relationships between coordinators and interns supported the notion that these learner

objectives had indeed been accepted and that efforts were being directed toward having gifted handicapped students function as integral members of the internship program.

Coordinator Objectives

At the workshop session it was agreed that local program coordinators would increase their ability to relate to the needs of the gifted handicapped by developing an expanded level of information about the nature of handicapping conditions and the availability of support services. While pre- and post-test data analyses were used to help determine how close the project has come to meeting this objective, on-site visits to local districts verified that coordinators were directing efforts toward achieving this goal. All had made contact with a special education/rehabilitation specialist; such persons were among the major sources of information regarding needed support services for interns currently in the project. In addition, the ground work was being laid in several places for meeting the needs of next year's potential interns.

Local School District Objectives

The consortium reached consensus with regard to a single, but highly meaningful, objective for the local school districts. It was hoped that as a result of the project's efforts, districts would develop a system for ensuring that the mainstreaming project could continue beyond this special funding period. Again, the on-site actions of both the EHIP coordinators and the local school district administrators indicated that this objective had been accepted and that efforts were being made to effect the continued

inclusion of gifted handicapped students as EHIP interns.

Process Objectives

Disseminated by the national office were three multi-faceted process objectives to be reached by the consortium itself. At the simplest level, consensus was reached regarding the need to work toward:

1. the establishment of an organization to deliver on the programs commitments;
2. the development of a system to support handicapped interns in relating to their placements;
3. expanding the number and variety of placement opportunities for gifted handicapped students.

At a second level, the workshop was directed toward clarification of the organization and methods which would facilitate the accomplishment of these process objectives.

Selection Criteria. As proposed in the goals for the workshop, participants at the plenary-training session formulated a statement of selection criteria which included definitions of both gifted and handicapped. In addition, avenues for identifying gifted and handicapped students were specified. Similarly, discussions were held regarding the types of internships which would best foster project success. Responses to the questionnaire indicated that twenty percent of the respondents did not feel that consensus had been reached on the criteria for either intern or sponsor selection. Field visits to participating districts indicated that there was, in fact, school district variation in both the method of identifying handicapped interns and the

matching of interns and sponsors.

Roles and Responsibilities of Consortium Members. All questionnaire respondants agreed that the roles and obligations of coordinators, sponsors, evaluators and national office staff had been clearly defined. However, the results reflect disagreement related to whether the roles of special educators (20%), school administrators (40%), and U.S.O.E. project officer (60%) had been clearly understood.

Operational Plan. There also appeared to be some variance with regard to the decided-upon timetable for implementation. From site visits it appeared that coordinators were following the usual semester schedule but had no special timelines related to the mainstreaming project. There appeared to be uncertainty regarding when and if a debriefing conference would be held. Because of the change from a full year (two-cycle) to a one semester (single-cycle) project evaluators were also uncertain as to which pieces of the operational plan were still in effect. The decisions made at the plenary-training workshop might have been helped by the dissemination of a new operational plan including a timetable for significant dates (e.g., contact national office, return data to evaluators, project bulletin due).

Evaluation Process. Another area of difficulty in organizational development related to cooperation with the evaluation process. A tentative evaluation design was outlined at the workshop and it was agreed that this design would be modified based upon both input received during the meeting and a final statement of objectives from the national office. The roles and obligations of evaluators, coordinators, and national office staff were also defined at this time and according to questionnaire respondants were understood.

Involvement with the on-going project indicated that this may in fact not have been the case and replication of the project would probably require greater emphasis on the details of the evaluation process. Objectives against which the project was to be evaluated were not sent by the national office until five weeks after the conference (less than four weeks before coordinators began the new semester). This significantly reduced the pre-implementation lead time needed to prepare an evaluation package and obtain permission for its use. Evaluators were not informed until late March as to whether three additionally proposed cities (Compton, Sacramento, and Springfield) were in fact to be included in the evaluation process. Although the timing created difficulty in trying to schedule site visits, Coordinators were cooperative in making arrangements.

In general, coordinators did not cooperate fully with the evaluation. As of the Debriefing Conference held in May, some pre-test data were still outstanding from several districts. At that time coordinators expressed dissatisfaction with some of tne evaluation instruments and, to the extent possible, changes in the evaluation procedures were made. In general, evaluation tools were returned late, were incomplete, or were not returned at all. A complete set of pre- and post-test data was received from none of the coordinators. In light of these problems one must question whether the roles were in fact fully understood with regard to responsibility for cooperating with the evaluation process.

Information-Sharing System. An additional component of organizational development related to the formulation of a communication system to effect timely information-sharing between coordinators, evaluators and national office staff. Questionnaire respondants agreed that a communication system had been

established. Monthly telephone conferences were to occur between coordinators and the national office. Reports of these interactions would then be sent to the evaluators by the national office. A project news bulletin was also to be developed to share information and problems among coordinators. In addition, the evaluators agreed to be available by phone and/or letter to provide requested consultation to both coordinators and to the national office. Discussions with coordinators verify periodic interaction between themselves and the national office. However, the Project evaluators were not part of a communication system. During site visit debriefings districts were provided with suggestions for program modifications as needed and/or as requested. Wherever possible coordinators were referred back to local providers. The evaluators did not receive other requests for consultations regarding either special education or the project evaluation.

Support System. Another major objective agreed upon for the consortium related to the development of a support system to help gifted handicapped interns. Basically, this was to be achieved by the identification of supplementary role models, generation of a bank of public and private resources that might provide support services and encouragement of the removal of architectural barriers at placement sites. Across all districts there appeared to be coordinator commitment to the process of developing a system which would support handicapped students in their internship placements. While no participants appeared actively involved in issues of physical access, several districts had developed a small bank of resources to support special needs.

Expanded Opportunities. The last process objective agreed upon for the

consortium related "to expansion of the number and variety of placement opportunities open to gifted handicapped students." Discussions with coordinators supported the notion of commitment to this aspect of the process. One coordinator had already recruited a new sponsor as a result of a student's preference for type of internship. Several other coordinators noted that the mainstreaming aspects of the internship program were to be included in their regular public relations and dissemination efforts.

Special Needs of the Handicapped

Lastly, one of the workshop's goals was the dissemination of information related to the special needs of the visually limited, hearing impaired, and orthopedically handicapped youngsters. To this end three special educators made presentations--each focusing on a target population with special reference to a mainstream setting. All questionnaire respondants agreed on the helpfulness of these presentations.

Summary

The five-day plenary-training workshop was intended primarily as a vehicle for reaching consortium consensus on project goals and processes to be employed in reaching these goals. Monitoring of the workshop, a follow-up questionnaire, and interviews at the local level were used to evaluate the overall effects of the workshop and the degree to which consensus had been reached on goals and processes.

There appeared to be general consensus with regard to the goals of the Mainstreaming Project. There was somewhat greater variance related to the implementation processes in this new undertaking. Roles and responsibilities

of team members (including cooperation with the evaluation process) appeared to have needed greater clarification. In addition, there was a need for greater attention to time schedules and the establishment of a communication system for information-sharing.

On-Site Visits

Visits were made to each of the six Project sites during the Spring of 1978. The site visits were arranged with the nine coordinators and included observations as well as discussions with the coordinators, interns, administrators and sponsors. The uniqueness of settings and programs resulting from local status of the handicapped, geographic and social/cultural differences, staff experience with the handicapped, and the resources available highlighted the national scope of the project.

A Site Visit Guide (Appendix C) was prepared for use as the base for information gathering.

Following are reports of the individual site visits.

On-Site Visit - Buffalo, New York

March 9, 10, 1978

General Overview

The Executive High School Internships Program offered by the Buffalo Public Schools is the only field-based career education program available to high school students who are achieving at average or above average levels. Participation is based upon a broad definition of gifted. Criteria for selection include intellectual level, general academic aptitude, leadership talents, and/or creative abilities. Interns spend a semester in a field placement which most often combines the service and administrative aspects of the sponsoring agency. After the first month, weekly seminars are organized by an executive committee elected by the interns. Content focuses upon the development of skills necessary for good management. Case studies and simulation techniques are utilized. A semester project is required as are daily logs. Students also participate in the recruitment of future interns by making presentations to students and prospective sponsors.

Participants receive credit for a semester of elective courses. Because of the unique situation in New York State, the internship may not substitute for diploma requirements set by the Board of Regents. As a result, students who have not fulfilled all of their Regents' credit are ineligible to participate in the executive internship program.

Intern Selection

Students are normally nominated for the program by school personnel. A

meeting is then held for all nominees after which applications are accepted from those students who remain interested. Screening of records and contacting references for recommendations are final steps in the intern selection.

Following the workshop in Orlando, it was decided that recruitment of gifted handicapped students for the EHIP would be a joint project incorporating members of the Buffalo Department of Special Education. Following a series of meetings, a general orientation to EHIP was held for all handicapped juniors and seniors who were known to the District Committee on the Handicapped. Included at this meeting were their parents, teachers and counselors. As a result of the meeting, seven applications were received.

After screening, two students were accepted into the Mainstreaming Project. The only applicant with a visual impairment was accepted for the program. Three hearing impaired youngsters were omitted after screening; one was a student in a parochial school and two others needed to complete graduation requirements for which the internship could not be substituted. The fourth student with a hearing loss was selected as the second intern. One of the orthopedically impaired students withdrew his application. The remaining student had cerebral palsy with severe orthoneuromuscular involvement. Since his participation would have required a full-time attendant, the screening committee found him to be "too handicapped" for participation.

Sponsor-Intern Match

Although students normally interview at several potential placements, this option was not available to the handicapped interns. Based upon information

obtained both from the EHIP application and during the screening interviews, the Coordinator selected a potential sponsor for each handicapped student. Both sponsors had previously participated in the internship program and both were willing to work with a handicapped student. Special Education personnel from the Buffalo Public Schools participated in discussions of placements with the sponsors and evaluated the physical plant for possible architectural barriers. Once the groundwork had been laid, the handicapped interns were sent for a single introductory interview. Having met the students, both sponsors agreed to remain in the project.

D.G. was placed with the general manager of a local radio station. Although he is interested in a career in radio communications, this goal was reportedly discouraged by D.G.'s vocational rehabilitation counselor. It was felt by the project staff that such a placement would give both D.G. and his counselor the opportunity realistically to evaluate the impact of D.G.'s visual limitations on his career choice.

C.G. requested placement in a Special Education program serving the deaf and hearing impaired. In keeping with the guidelines established at the Plenary-Training Workshop, such a site was discouraged. As an alternative, C.G. was interning with the Director of United Way of Buffalo. It was hoped that this placement would provide C.G. with exposure to a wide variety of careers allied with but not part of Special Education services.

It should be noted that although the final decision involved the utilization of sponsors who were already known to the EHIP Coordinator, a meeting with the Buffalo Advisory Council on the Handicapped generated a list of potential

new sponsors for interns with handicapping conditions.

Intern Performance

Interns had been at their placements for about one month at the time of the evaluation. Although very different in their personal characteristics, both D.G. and C.G. participated actively in the seminar and had no difficulty interacting with non-disabled peers. The quality of their daily logs was also comparable to those of other interns.

By the end of the first month, D.G. had participated in both the service and the administrative aspects of the radio station. He was known to all of the employees and could explain the work of each office. D.G.'s sponsor reported that his performance was as good as that of former non-disabled interns and was, in fact, better than some. According to D.G.'s counselor, he had been classified as an underachiever. In addition, he was said to have problems in mobility. Neither of these problems seemed apparent from his performance as an intern.

C.G. was under the direct sponsorship of the Director of United Way. At the time observed, she was involved in the verification of computer output, a task which would lend support to fund-raising efforts. C.G.'s quiet personality and preference for service-related tasks made it necessary for the sponsor to make a conscious effort to guide her into management activities more closely related to decision-making. While C.G. appeared to have good speech and adequate speech reading ability, she expressed dissatisfaction with her ability to perform at meetings and conferences, avoiding such settings whenever possible. As a result she could not, at the time of the interview, explain the purpose and

function of United Way or its relationship to other community agencies. The sponsor reported that while C.G. lacked the self-confidence and initiative shown by past interns, she had been showing increased ability to cope with her placement. It was anticipated that as C.G. became more comfortable in the field, she would show logarithmic increase in her level of performance. C.G.'s presentations at the EHIP Debriefing Conference and at the annual convention of the Council for Exceptional Children in May were well organized and well presented. She made note of her increased feelings of confidence in her ability to perform adequately on-site. During her internship semester C.G. had also been attending "charm school." It is assumed that this change in self-concept can be attributed to the combined affects of the two programs.

Special Modifications

Although both D.G. and C.G. were fully integrated into regular high school classes, a link with Special Education was maintained through their guidance counselors. Trained to meet the special needs of a specific handicap, the counselors have been available for pre-placement conferences and support intervention for students, sponsors or the EHIP Coordinator.

D.G.'s counselor offered the mobility training necessary for him to get from home to placement and to move freely within the facility. More general skill training allowed D.G. the freedom to participate in work-related activities outside the radio station itself.

C.G.'s counselor had recently been changed and the evaluation interview proved to be her first contact with the new counselor. As a result of the on-site discussions, the counselor agreed to arrange regular speech therapy

sessions for C.G. It was suggested that there be ongoing contact between the therapist and the sponsor so that speech reading skills might be directed toward the content of the internship.

Dissemination

As part of the school district's plan for implementing the Mainstreaming Project, arrangements had been made for coverage by the Buffalo Evening News. In addition, a story of D.G. was reportedly to be published in Jet Magazine. Within the school system, publicity was achieved through presentations to the Committee on the Handicapped and the Advisory Council on the Handicapped. The project was included by the Board of Education liaison member in the "State of the Handicapped" message.

Summary and Recommendations

As implemented by the Buffalo Public Schools, the EHIP Mainstreaming Project demonstrated close cooperation between the Program Coordinator and the Department of Special Education. Special Education counselors were available to provide support to interns, sponsors and Coordinator as needed.

From a small pool of gifted handicapped students, two moderately impaired youngsters were chosen. Although currently mainstreamed in regular high school classes, a third student was not allowed to participate because he was considered too severely involved (i.e., he would have required a full-time aide). Both participants received support from their counselors, but no special modifications were required. Funds earmarked by the national office of the EHIP were therefore not necessary to accommodate these interns.

If mainstreaming is to be a continued aspect of the executive memberships offered by the Buffalo Public Schools, it is suggested that attention be given to the inclusion of more severely involved youngsters who otherwise meet the criteria for participation. While the Department of Special Education is pleased with the pilot project and would like to see it permanently installed, personnel interviewed feel that this is feasible only to the extent that additional funds are not necessary. It is suggested that negotiations between the Department of Special Education, the Committee on the Handicapped, and the Advisory Council on the Handicapped may result in the formulation of a process which would allow the school district to utilize the content of individual educational plans as a base for funding the special needs of individual disabled students.

On-Site Visit - Des Moines, Iowa

March 23, 24, 1978

General Overview

The Executive Internship Program offered by the Des Moines Public Schools is one of the many career and vocational education activities available to high school students in the district. Executive interns spend a semester in a field placement designed to introduce concepts of management and professional service delivery.

Interns earn credit in English, social studies and two elective subjects. To receive credits the intern keeps a journal of daily activities, maintains an appropriate level of performance on-site and presents a project to the high school at the end of the semester. Through the weekly seminars, students are exposed to career opportunities in fields other than the ones in which they are interning. In addition, case studies and simulation activities are used to facilitate learning of management-related skills.

The program coordinator, in concert with the school district's Director of Education, identified a series of student-directed goals, program processes, and student, sponsor, and coordinator responsibilities. A measure of the extent to which the internship program meets its goals is suggested through the completion of self-directed forms related to the above stipulations.

Intern Selection

The Des Moines internship program accepts both high school juniors and seniors. The EHIP coordinator actively seeks applicants who have demonstrated

leadership and initiative in their schools. Sponsors may define special talents, skills and/or backgrounds which they deem to be useful in specific settings. These criteria are also considered during intern recruitment.

Applicants are normally referred through high school principals, counselors or instructors. Although the special project sought physically disabled pupils who were mainstreamed, none of the high school nominators submitted the name of a handicapped student. Therefore, nominations of handicapped pupils were specifically requested from the Special Education Department.

All potential applicants, including those with physical impairments, attended a personal interview which included parent participation. Those who remained interested in the executive internship program filed a formal application. Final selection of participants was made by the EHIP Coordinator.

The two handicapped interns who were selected met the basic criteria set by the school district for participation in the EHIP. Both students were functionally independent and had had previous experience in a mainstreamed setting.

Sponsor-Intern Match

Qualifying applicants meet several potential sponsors, allowing both the prospective intern and the sponsors to indicate choices. Final pairing is done by the coordinator. In principle, handicapped interns followed the above procedure. Potential sponsors were told of the intern's impairment but no sponsors withdrew as a result of this advance information.

L.A., a female with limited visual abilities, was interested in pursuing

a career as a Special Education teacher. In keeping with the guidelines set by the EHIP consortium, a placement in this field was discouraged. L.A. instead chose to interview for a legal services internship. She competed for these positions with five of her non-handicapped peers and was selected by her current sponsor as the number one candidate. She was also favorably rated by the other potential sponsors.

The second intern, who is wheelchair bound, was one of two interns interested in a placement which combined business and accounting. He was placed in his second rather than his first choice. In part this was the decision of the coordinator, based upon his interview with the student and his knowledge of the demands of each sponsor.

Intern Performance

L.A. is a vivacious young lady whose poise, self-confidence and talents allowed her to move quickly into an internship as an assistant to a staff attorney for Legal Aid in Polk County. When interviewed the sponsor was fully satisfied with L.A.'s performance.

S.G., the second handicapped intern, appeared to be having greater difficulty adjusting to his internship with the Comptroller of the Central Iowa Association of Local Governments. While still considered too unseasoned to independently interact with contractors outside of the sponsoring agency, S.G. was working independently on a needed data organization project.

Both sponsor and coordinator agreed that S.G.'s performance was inferior to that of previous non-handicapped interns in this same setting. However,

it was also agreed that S.G. had shown significant improvement in performance over time. Personal appearance had improved as had ability to interact with staff. In addition, S.G. indicated a re-thinking of career aims as a result of the internship experience. The sponsor had planned out a series of opportunities which would bring S.G. closer to the decision-making and administrative center of the agency. His behavior at the national conference of the Council for Exceptional Children reflected mastery of the organizational structure of the sponsoring agency but also called attention to S.G.'s immaturity and difficulty in relating to an adult "business" environment.

Special Modifications

While severely limited in visual ability, L.A. is currently able to read regular print with magnification and has excellent mobility skills. Although she is unable to drive a vehicle (almost a necessity in Des Moines), L.A. obtained transportation to get from home to her internship site and from the Legal Aide Society office to the various courthouses and halls of records. In addition, she consistently attends seminars although the location changes weekly.

During this project period, no special modifications were necessary to accommodate L.A.'s full participation in the internship program. However, her vision is rapidly degenerating and she will, within the next few years, lose total vision. In anticipation of this time, L.A. has learned braille, typing, dictation and use of the opticon. In addition, she is well acquainted with those public and voluntary health agencies which will be of later assistance

to her.

Special transportation arrangements were the single modification essential to S.G.'s participation as an intern. In order to facilitate his internship, the Pupil Services Department agreed to provide transportation to and from the placement. In addition, the local school system agreed to pay for extra travel on Fridays when S.G. went from home to seminar site to high school to home.

Since S.G. needed no other special accommodations, the school system's abosrption of these extra travel expenses meant that the special funds set aside by EHIP were not needed. However, the potential need for funds was pointed up when S.G. was considering a special term project which would have necessitated his traveling throughout Polk County.

Although S.G. is in a mainstreaming project, he maintains close contact with his special counselor at Tech High School. Through and with the counselor, S.G. makes special arrangements for obtaining a driver's license and a specially equipped van, completing applications to architecturally accessible colleges and acquiring special funding through the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Dissemination

Throughout the school year, the EHIP Coordinator conducted informational programs for interested schools, agencies and service organizations. Formal presentations reportedly were made to high school students, faculty and counselors; attendees at the annual high school open house; Special Education,

Career Education and Gifted Education conferences; civic groups; and Deans of Admission at in-state colleges and universities. Contact with this latter group helps clarify and meaning of the EHIP experience when it appears on a student's transcript. In addition to formal presentations, articles have appeared in the local and trade newspapers.

Summary and Recommendations

The Executive High School Internships program is reported to have good support from the business community as well as from parents and students. The program is viewed as a realistic way of gaining firsthand career experiences that can assist students in making career decisions. Previous experience with the program indicates that interns revise their career choices upward after participating in EHIP.

The program has obviously gained the support of both the Pupil Services Department and the Secondary Education Department. Although the two handicapped interns performed at different levels, the merits of the program for both were recognized. As a result of this pilot project, directors of both departments indicated a willingness to permanently install the mainstreaming aspects of the internship program. It was anticipated that, as the mainstreaming aspect of the EHIP became better known, nominations of handicapped students might come from a wider variety of sources (i.e., counselors, teachers).

Neither of the interns participating in this special one-semester project needed special modifications that necessitated expenditure of project funds. While there were some additional costs for keeping these two students in the

project, the costs were absorbed through the use of Special Education funds. For funding purposes, handicapped students mainstreamed into a regular program are weighted at 1.7. It was anticipated that these extra monies could be used for the purchase of special materials/equipment which might be necessary in the future.

On-Site Visit - Springfield, Illinois

April 6, 7, 1978

General Overview

Within the Springfield High Schools, the Executive High School Internship Program is part of an alternative program which provides a mix of school-based and community-based learning experiences. The Board of Education grants a semester of high school credit to those students who successfully complete the internship program. Student transcripts include a description of the specific internship in which the student is engaged. Included are responsibilities assumed and skills learned.

Interns are assigned to both executive and professional service positions. However, seminar content focuses primarily on the analysis of issues in management, administration and decision-making. Sponsors and/or other community persons serve as resource persons during the case study discussions. As part of the total internship process, students are asked to contribute to their home school in some meaningful way. Although there is no coordinator follow-up on this aspect of the program, first-semester interns sometimes function as peer counselors during the second semester in which they return to school.

Intern Selection

Participating interns are selected primarily from the Springfield Public High Schools. Each semester, however, there were a small number of interns from other school districts. In those cases where distance prohibited daily commuting, arrangements were made for interns to live with families in Springfield.

Selection criteria for the Springfield program included not only high measured intelligence but also demonstrated special talents, motivation and/or interest. Potential participants came from a pool of high school seniors who were nominated by high school counselors and principals. Although the EHIP Mainstreaming Project was seeking gifted handicapped students who were in mainstreamed settings (i.e., attending regular classes in local high school), it was necessary specifically to seek nominations from the Office of Special Education. Local personnel could not cite definite reasons as to why no students with handicapping conditions had been nominated in the general call for nominees.

After nominations were made, the EHIP Coordinator met with nominees, explained the program and accepted formal applications. Applicants' records were reviewed and interviews were held with the candidate and his/her parents. Upon completion of this process, one handicapped student (K.A.) was selected as a participant in the internship program. Paraplegic as the result of an automobile accident, K.A. met all selection criteria agreed to by the Project Consortium.

Sponsor-Intern Match

For all interns, sponsor interviews were arranged in accordance with the career interest expressed by students during the interview process. When necessary, the coordinator recruited new sponsors (and potential sponsors) based on student preferences. Final placement was dependent upon mutual selection of both the sponsor and the intern. K.A. participated in the interview-placement process along with her non-handicapped peers. Her particular

interest in medical arts illustration eventually led to the recruitment of a new sponsor in the program.

Intern Performance

As an intern, K.A. was in a field site primarily directed toward delivery of service to clients. While she received some direct training in the field of medical drawing and illustration, she was also exposed to the decision-making processes related to personnel administration, availability of materials and supplies, and distribution of work assignments. K.A.'s sponsor reported no problems and favorably compared her performance with that of practicum students from the SIU Medical School. Similarly, the coordinator noted K.A.'s ability to compete successfully with her non-handicapped peers in the internship program.

Special Modifications

Students are required to provide their own transportation to and from internship locations. Since K.A. has her own specially equipped van, travel did not present a problem.

Because K.A. is in a wheelchair, Special Education staff evaluated the architectural accessibility of the medical school before she began her internship. The physical plant was considered to be barrier free. However, the ramp leading from the parking lot to the building is too steep for K.A. to negotiate alone. She therefore left her van in the front driveway and made arrangements for a co-worker to move the van to the parking lot. Her presence and that of another handicapped employee caused the faculty to consider

rebuilding the ramp leading to the parking lot. The light-tight revolving door to the facility's dark room presented an architectural barrier to its regular use by K.A. Therefore training in photographic development techniques had to be omitted from the internship experience.

Friday seminars were held at a variety of sponsor locations in Springfield. When selecting sites, other interns reportedly learned to evaluate architectural accessibility and arrange for modifications when possible (e.g., special parking privileges, use of service elevator, portable ramps). In those cases where modifications could not be made, the interns provided whatever physical assistance was needed.

K.A. was functionally independent in school and intern-related situations. Therefore, minimal contact with Special Education persons was required. Similarly, use of specially allocated Project funds was not necessary to facilitate full participation in the internship program.

Dissemination

Knowledge of the internship program appeared to be statewide as demonstrated by the out-of-district interns who were participating. Dissemination of the mainstreaming aspects of the program was incorporated into the already existing network for sharing information related to the EHIP. At all levels, dissemination occurred through person-to-person contacts of the interns, parents, sponsors and coordinator. In addition, the coordinator made special efforts to affect inclusion of reports of the program in statewide conferences on the disadvantaged and handicapped, workshops related to the state's responsibility toward education, newspaper articles, planned T.V. interviews

and the speakers' list of state and local civic groups. As a result of this semester's presentations, The Chicago School system has already requested permission to send a handicapped intern to the program.

Summary and Recommendations

The Executive High School Internships Program appears to be a well-organized one which has obviously gained the full support of both the Springfield Public Schools' Board of Education and the Illinois Office of Education. Although there was only one handicapped intern participating in the Mainstreaming Project, her participation served to stimulate local school district awareness regarding the need to include gifted handicapped students in the pool of potential EHIP interns. In general, local school officials did not foresee great problems related to future inclusion of handicapped interns. It was generally agreed that Special Education funds could be made available for meeting special needs.

Since the project was directed toward students who were already mainstreamed, it was suggested that the district systematize a process by which all nominees (i.e., including the impaired) come through high school counselors and principals. Since the coordinator-to-intern ratio at the time of the project was one-to-thirty, one of the issues as yet unresolved is how the district might handle the increased manpower hours needed to supervise/coordinate internships for more severely involved youngsters.

On-Site Visit - Sacramento, California

April 10, 11, 1978

General Overview

The Executive High School Internships Program is offered as part of the regular curriculum for high school seniors in the Sacramento Public Schools. Student transcripts reflect credit for coursework in Social Studies and include a description of the internship program.

Interview with the Deputy Superintendent of Instruction left the impression that EHIP has proven its worth and is accepted by administrative personnel at the Board of Education. The program, however, faces continuing difficulty convincing high school teachers and counselors (especially social studies personnel) that the field experiences and weekly seminars are equivalent to the government and economics courses in which students would otherwise enroll. Since it is common for students to seek teacher guidance in course selection, this questionable support or difference in value judgment is reflected in difficulty recruiting both able-bodied and handicapped students.

Intern Selection

As do the majority of executive internship programs, the Sacramento Public Schools define gifted by using a broad range of criteria which include tested intelligence, achievement levels, special talent, high level of motivation and self-interest. All senior high school students may apply to the program and the internship is included as an elective option in the listing

of course offerings which is used by students in developing their individual programs.

Teacher and counselor resistance to recommend this option to students was balanced by a presentation made by the EHIP coordinator to individual classes of prospective interns and their teachers. Students who were interested in participtating filed an application at that time. Records were reviewed and recommendations were sought from the students' counselors. The final pool of applicants was then interviewed individually and the program was more fully explained to parents.

Although there were reportedly a number of handicapped students who have been fully integrated into the high school program, none were identified through the routine recruitment process. For the purposes of the Mainstreaming Project, therefore special nominations were sought through the district's Special Education Office. As a result, the pool of potential interns with handicapping conditions was limited to a small group of youngsters who attended classes with their non-handicapped peers but who were closely identified with Special Education. All of the candidates were in a single homeroom with a teacher/counselor trained to provide resource services (e.g., tutoring, ancillary therapy, college advisement) oriented toward the special needs of this group. From this class a single intern was selected, C.G.--female, wheelchair bound as the result of Charcot-Marie-Tooth Disease (neuromuscular atrophy). Although the internship is normally open only to high school seniors, C.L. was, in fact, a junior. Both the coordinator and the Special Education counselor recognized that C.L. was accepted into the EHIP only because of her physical

impairment. She does not fully meet the selection criteria established by the EHIP national consortium, but it was felt that C.L. was the student in the available pool who was most likely to succeed in the program.

Sponsor-Intern Match

Sponsor-intern interviews are arranged, based upon preferences expressed by the students during the initial coordinator interviews. New sponsors are recruited as necessary, based upon student interests.

C.L. presented a notable lack of specificity regarding her career goals. After discussions which included the EHIP coordinator and the Special Education counselor, an interview was arranged for placement with an administrative aide at the California State Rehabilitation Office. Since the Director is handicapped, it was felt that he might provide C.L. with a supplementary role model. It was anticipated that in addition to administrative training, C.L. might be exposed to the vocation-oriented field services which would be available to her through the Rehabilitation Office. Formal placement was affected after the interview process.

Intern Performance

C.L.'s level of performance at the time of the on-site visit was reported to be below that of her non-handicapped peers. It was also below the level of handicapped interns in other districts. C.L.'s minimal involvement in administrative aspects of the organization appeared to be a result of her fear of participating in new activities and the sponsor's unwillingness to guide her through the complexities of his office. C.L. was pleased to be involved in clerical/secretarial

tasks, sought minimal contact with the sponsor and elected not to accompany him to meetings if given an option. The sponsor felt that the goals of EHIP may be too ambitious for a high school student and therefore that C.L. should not be "pushed" to participate and/or observe management-related activities of the organization. As a result, C.L. had minimal understanding of what the State Rehabilitation Office does and how the work of her specific office supports the total effort.

Both the EHIP coordinator and the high school Special Education counselor had spoken with the sponsor and attempts were made at getting him more directly involved in working with C.L. Because school personnel felt that she was not being pushed to her true level of potential, a second series of meetings were planned. At the time of the on-site visit, it was suggested that the term project be used as the focal point for modifying the sponsor-intern relationship.

Because of previous commitments as a participant in the Special Olympics, C.L. was absent from a number of Friday seminars. This further interfered with her exposure to management concepts. She had not as yet submitted an outline for her term project nor could she, at the time of the interview, indicate any areas which she might be interested in exploring. C.L.'s performance continued to be poor and in May it was determined that she was ineligible to attend the EHIP Debriefing Conference or to present her intern experiences to the Council for Exceptional Children.

Special Modifications

C.L's previous commitment as a participant in the Special Olympics necessitated scheduling considerations related to the time she needed for

practice sessions and for the meets themselves. These sessions most often conflicted with the Friday seminar; occasionally they competed with scheduled placement hours. While all parties (i.e., sponsor, counselor, coordinator) agreed on the importance of C.L.'s participation in the Olympics, no mechanism was found to make up lost time through modification of schedules.

Special transportation was a second area requiring attention. Arrangements were made for the special school buses to take C.L. to and from her placement on Monday through Thursday. Because the seminar location changed weekly, C.L. could not be accommodated on Friday. Also, varying schedules related to the Olympics could not be accommodated. In interview, the Deputy Superintendent indicated that funds should be available for providing special taxi service. In fact, the coordinator was unable to arrange for special funding through the Board of Education and often played the role of chauffeur for C.L. It was not until April that the coordinator was aware that she could request reimbursement from the EHIP national office for expenses related to the Mainstreaming Project.

Dissemination

While there have been a small number of news clippings related to the EHIP, the primary mode of dissemination at this time is person-to-person contact by the coordinator, sponsors, students and parents of interns. For the purposes of disseminating information to colleges, a letter describing the program is attached to high school transcripts. At the time of the visit there had been no special dissemination efforts directed toward the mainstreaming aspects of the program.

Summary and Recommendations

While the EHIP was an established high school course offering, there was some resistance from teachers with regard to whether a field experience could provide students with learnings equivalent to those they would get in the classroom. In the absence of full support for the program, it may have been premature to introduce the mainstreaming aspect.

No appropriate candidates were nominated to participate in the EHIP Mainstreaming Project. Instead of postponing participation, the district made a forced selection and attempted the project with a student who did not meet the criteria for selection of gifted handicapped interns. Although there had been on-going contact with the Special Education counselor no mechanism had been outlined for providing program modifications needed for C.L. to participate fully, i.e.: When will lost field hours be made up? How will content of missed seminars be learned? How can special transportation needs be met? The situation was further complicated by the sponsor's apparent misunderstanding of the EHIP and of his specific role in the program.

If gifted handicapped students are to the mainstreamed into the EHIP in future semesters, it would seem advantageous to make contact with the school district's director of Special Education. Unlike the Special Education teacher/counselor, a central office person should be helpful in recruitment of handicapped students who formerly received special services but who are now fully mainstreamed. Further, a central officer in Special Education should be of help in making advance accommodations for special resources and/or accommodations which might be necessary if a handicapped student is to be a full participant in the internship program. A plan for the continued mainstreaming of

gifted handicapped youngsters should include the process by which funds can be made available for special needs.

It is also suggested that the Board of Education and especially EHIP personnel increase their efforts to disseminate information related to the program. Such action would probably increase teacher support for the Executive Internship Program, help tap into the pool of handicapped students who have already been successfully integrated into school and increase the pool of potential sponsors who understand and are in agreement with the goals of the program.

Although this mainstreaming placement situation was not fully in tune with the goals of the EHIP Mainstreaming Project, positive effects were noted. The sponsor felt that his staff had benefited greatly from daily interaction with a handicapped person and that they now had a better notion of the work done by field personnel attached to the Rehabilitation Office. More importantly, C.L. had, as a result of her contact with the coordinator and sponsor, decided to apply for admission to a junior college. This upward revision of C.L's career goals and preparation should not be overlooked.

On-Site Visit - Compton, California

April 13, 14, 1978

General Overview

The Executive Internship Program for the Compton Unified School District is a well-organized one; it has two coordinators and a large number of interns representing the district's three high schools. Coordinators maintain extensive and useful documentation related to program processes.

Student transcripts reflect the courses in social studies, English and physical education for the internship semester. In addition, fifteen elective units are designated based upon the type of internship in which the student is enrolled. An explanation of the internship program is also attached to the intern's transcript.

Interns earn letter grades in twenty-five of the thirty semester units. Grades are based upon fifteen variables which reflect performance at the field placement, on daily logs, at weekly seminars and on the final term project. In addition, seven special assignments (e.g., analysis of placement organization) are expected of interns.

With the exception of internships with practicing attorneys, all students work under the sponsorship of management/administrative personnel in business, community affairs, cultural, educational, legal and medical fields. Weekly seminars are arranged by the interns and focus upon the dissemination of information related to preparing for employment.

Intern Selection

Recruitment begins in the middle of the semester prior to the one for which interns are sought. General announcements are made to students, counselors,

teachers and administrators. Nomination forms are distributed to school personnel and following their return a general meeting is held for interested students. At each district high school, a liaison person processes applications, attaching transcripts and pertinent comments. The coordinators hold interviews with applicants and final selections are made.

Utilizing the above procedure for intern selection, recruitment efforts tapped one gifted handicapped youngster with mild ortho-neuromuscular impairment. A.C. has had extensive mainstreaming experience, having been transferred from a special school to a regular classroom in the fourth grade. Since A.C. entered the internship program without special reference to the Mainstreaming Project, the coordinators attempted to locate additional handicapped students who might participate. However, the Compton Unified School District contracts with other districts for the purpose of providing Special Education services. This severely limited the available pool of potential gifted handicapped interns. In addition, Compton did not have a Special Education coordinator at the time recruitment efforts were being made.

Sponsor-Intern Match

Students select prospective sponsors from an extensive list of alternatives. New placements are added to the list as necessary. As interviews are completed, students and sponsors give preferences. Coordinators make a final match. For the purposes of interviews and sponsor selection, A.C. followed the process outlined for the program as a whole.

Intern Performance

A.C. and one of her non-disabled peers were assigned to placements with the Director of Community Interface Programs for Rockwell International. The

two young women had different primary responsibilities, with A.C. assigned to the Affirmative Action Office attached to the Division of Materials Procurement. A.C.'s direct supervisor was pleased with her performance, and the Director found no notable differences in the quality of work done by the two interns. On interview, A.C. was able to outline the role of the Affirmative Action Office and its relationship with other offices. Both coordinators rated A.C. highly and found her performance on assignments and in seminar to be equal to that of her peers. The intern's mother indicated that A.C. has shown more self-confidence and poise since beginning her field placement. In addition, A.C. talked about her daily experiences, although she never did so while attending high school classes.

Special Modifications

A.C. was totally independent and, although she manifested a spastic gait, she had unlimited ambulation. Since A.C. drove her own car, transportation was not a problem. On-site, A.C. was given a desk telephone of her own. This installation reduced the amount of walking which would ordinarly he required to maintain contact with other personnel at the internship site and was suggested by the sponsor because of the unusually long distances which occur between offices.

The cost of the phone service was absorbed by the sponsoring agency. No additional funding was needed from either the school district or the national office of the EHIP.

Dissemination

Information about the executive internship program has been disseminated primarily through personal contact between those related to the program (i.e.,

students, sponsors, coordinators) and persons in the Compton community. For example, A.C.'s sponsor was scheduled to include the program in a speech before a local civic group.

In addition, the public relations office of the school district had prepared an information release about the EHIP with special reference to the Mainstreaming Project. The article would appear in the school district's house organ and was also to be submitted to the local newspapers.

Summary and Recommendations

The Compton Unified School District appears to be in full support of the Executive High School Internship Program. The process of program implementation is well documented and would easily allow for the transfer of the program from one coordinator to another should this be necessary. A broad definition of gifted was applied in selection of interns. Attention to special talents and interests resulted in a heterogenous group of participating interns.

A.C. entered the EHIP without special reference to the Mainstreaming Project. Her nomination and selection through the regular recruitment process stand as an example of one goal toward which the Mainstreaming Project was directed. Since A.C. functioned as a non-handicapped person, there were no reports of special problems related to her physical impairment.

Some attention might have been paid, however, to a mechanism by which more severely disabled students could be integrated into the executive internship program. Compton's new coordinator of Special Education services foresees two groups from which future interns with handicapping conditions might be selected. Since Compton has now established a central Special Education Unit,

greater efforts will be made to find other handicapped students who, like A.C., have been fully integrated into regular high school classes. In addition, the functions and values of the internship program will be disseminated to Special Education teachers, who provide contracted services to Compton's handicapped high school students. In anticipation of nominating qualified seniors to the EHIP, these teachers could, during freshman and junior years, make efforts to prepare students for participating in the program. By properly using the individual education plan, mandated for all handicapped students under PL 94-142, Special Education teachers could provide preparatory integration experiences, and procure special equipment which might be necessary and/or teacher work-related social skills.

On-Site Visit - New York, New York

April 28, -

May 17, 22, 24, 31, 1978

General Overview

The internship program in New York City has developed into a large alternative program involving over 15 coordinators and a program supervisor. Students participating in the executive internship program live in every borough of the city and represent a cross-section of New York City high school students. The program has established certain requirements for interns which enable them to earn a semester's worth of credits. However, participation in the program can prevent a student from attending a class which is seen as crucial to preparation for Board of Regents' state-wide examinations. Therefore, each student who considers participating in the program must weight his/her own needs and interests and arrange his/her schedule to insure sufficient credits for graduation.

The internship program takes advantage of the many resources of the city in the development of internship sites. Law, medicine, banking, social work, fashion, and theater are among the fields in which internships are available. The seminars which interns attend weekly have been designed to enable students to share and learn from the experience of others. Interns are given the responsibility for planning and organizing a seminar at their field sites. Seminars generally include an overview of the activities and work at the site, special interest topics (e.g., malpractice and the law), and discussion of job opportunities.

Intern Selection

The usual procedure which the New York City coordinators use in intern selection includes several steps. They make presentations at each of the schools in which they work and solicit applications from the students. These applications are then screened in order to select those students who are suitable for the program. In order to involve handicapped students in the internship program, it was necessary for the coordinators to alter this procedure. They first approached the special education personnel at the New York City Board of Education and requested their help in identifying suitable handicapped students. Unfortunately, the Special Education representative's letters to each of the high schools inviting intern applicants were not fruitful in recruitment. As a result, the coordinators approached private schools in the area which serve handicapped students. At the Lexington School for the Deaf, the guidance counselor was able to select two students she felt would be suitable for the program and who were interested and willing to participate in it. The coordinators also visited public schools in their areas that had special education programs and recruited three additional students.

In summary, the coordinators found themselves hard pressed to locate handicapped students, and therefore were not as selective as they otherwise would have been. Rather than screening the handicapped interns as the other interns had been, the coordinators worked hard simply to locate five appropriate students.

Sponsor-Intern Match

Non-handicapped interns are required to go on interviews and compete with each other for the field placements in which they are interested. Although

each of the handicapped students was required to have an initial interview with his/her sponsor, none competed with other interns for their internship placements.

The Special Education representative felt that the EHIP should initiate its handicapped gifted internship efforts with mildly rather than severely handicapped students in order to facilitate integration and assure high level on-the-job function.

Intern Performance

DD is a deaf student from the Lexington School for the Deaf. She was placed with the Coordinator for Departmental Volunteers for the Department of Corrections because of her expressed interest in social work. Both the sponsor and coordinator were very pleased with DD's performance on her job. The sponsor indicated that she originally expected DD's abilities to be much less than they proved to be. DD's responsibilities and opportunities were expanded as the sponsor's faith in this student grew. The highlight of DD's internship was a field visit to Riker's Island, a correctional institution, during which she had the opportunity to speak with a deaf prisoner. The personal satisfaction that DD found in this experience convinced her that she would like to pursue a career in social work. However, her experience included a large portion of time doing clerical work. This seemed to occur both because of the nature of work at the placement and because of DD's expressed need to spend time not interacting with others. The only job that DD could not perform was answering and initiating phone calls. Probably the most significant result of DD's experience in the internship program was her decision to attend a college for hearing students, rather than one for the deaf.

JJ, who has spina bifida and uses a wheelchair and crutches, was placed at WNBC Radio Division with the music coordinator. He had expressed an interest in a career in this area, possible writing ads, or being a disc jockey. Originally this internship seemed to offer JJ an exciting "glamour" placement. As problems developed, however, he became unhappy with the situation.

At the beginning, transportation was a major problem for JJ. He spent many hours waiting for special buses that frequently never arrived. Several months into the semester, these problems were finally resolved, and JJ could depend on bus transportation to his Monday through Thursday placement. His coordinator, late in the semester made arrangements for providing taxi service to and from the Friday seminars. However, his problems on the job were not eliminated. JJ had to spend a large part of his day doing what he considered to be "busy work." The sponsor indicated that union restrictions prevented her from letting JJ get involved with many of the activities in which he expressed an interest. Nevertheless, she agreed that he was not getting all the experiences which perhaps he could have had, had she been willing to take the initiative to involve him. JJ seemed unable to take the initiative himself in this situation in spite of his dissatisfaction with his job assignments.

His social participation during the observed Friday seminar was minimal, and his school contact also mentioned that JJ was not able to develop strong social relationships. Thus, both sponsor and intern attitudes and actions worked together to limit the internship experience for JJ. He did not seem to have developed his career goals into realistic job possibilities from this experience. It should be kept in mind, however, that JJ was only a junior in high school this year and therefore has another year to crystallize his goals.

ER, a deaf student from John F. Kennedy High School, was placed with the Manager of Letters of Credit for Citibank in Manhattan. ER was a friendly, outgoing young woman who was able to communicate well in spite of her handicap. She had a very positive work experience in her internship. Her sponsor was most satisfied with her performance and indicated that he had been pleasantly surprised at her work abilities. The only job activity that ER was unable to do was to use the telephone. In her job assignment, it was sometimes necessary to speak with people in other departments. Rather than being able to pick up the phone and make the contact, ER had to go to the other departments to communicate directly to other individuals.

Also, questions were raised as to the "executive" quality of her daily work. She spent most of her day at a computer terminal sending out and receiving money from foreign countries. She did not have the opportunity to attend departmental meetings or to interact with other executives during the day. Aside from the fact that her daily activities did not reflect an executive type position, ER's internship was highly successful. She enjoyed her work, socialized well, and clearly was able to perform well on all assignments given to her. In addition, her sponsor was anxious to hire her to continue doing her job as soon as she graduated in June.

LR, a quadraplegic young man from Grover Cleveland High School, was placed with the Director of Legal Services for the Department of Corrections in Manhattan. A number of problems occurred at the outset of LR's experience with the internship program. Apparently, there was a breakdown in communication between the EHIP coordinator, LR's teacher and LR in regard to participation in the program. It seems that LR and his teacher assumed he was accepted into the program when in fact the coordinator had not planned to include LR since he did

not satisfy the requirements of a program for gifted. Nevertheless, it was finally decided that LR could participate in the program. The coordinator then was unable to place LR in a site that matched his interest in computers. However, a placement satisfactory to LR was found in the Legal Services Department.

Finally, when LR was set to go, he encountered transportation difficulties. Only after his teacher, the coordinator and his sponsor (who was able to exert some political pressure through local officials) worked to obtain services for him, were the transportation problems eliminated. The building where LR worked was not barrier free and it was necessary for him to use the freight elevator in order to get to his office on the 13th floor.

In spite of these numerous difficulties and problems, LR had a positive internship. The coordinator, sponsor and school contact each indicated that LR improved significantly in his social skills. LR also reported that he felt that he had grown in this area. His sponsor was very satisfied with his work and offered him a job as soon as he graduated. (This offer differed from ER's in that his sponsor intended to give him a training program and expected him to attend college.) However, since LR still had a strong interest in computers and really did not want to work during the summer, he did not accept the job offer. His school contact was concerned about this, and indicated that LR had not clarified his career goals and certainly did not have a realistic view of his job opportunities.

LR indicated that while he enjoyed his internship, working with his sponsor and meeting other people with whom he worked, he still desired to pursue his interest in computers. The school contact questioned whether LR had the academic

ability to handle a college program in computers and was really missing an ideal opportunity by turning down his sponsor's job offer.

AM, a deaf student from the Lexington School for the Deaf, had an internship in the pharmacy department at Lutheran Medical Center in Brooklyn. He had an expressed interest in pharmacy at the beginning of the internship, but, also had some doubts about his ability to be a pharmacist. At the conclusion of this project, AM was delighted to report that he no longer had those doubts about his ability and knew that he in fact could do it. He expressed some dissatisfaction with his daily routine and the personality of his sponsor. After telling his sponsor about his desire to expand his work experience, some improvements were made. However, the sponsor explained that legal restrictions were limiting the range of AM's activities. Although some of the other pharmacists were assigning him work that interested him, his sponsor stopped this practice, apparently for legal reasons. The sponsor indicated that he was completely satisfied with AM's performance, and that his earlier anxieties quickly disappeared as he began working with AM.

Special Modifications

As mentioned in the description of LR's internship, it was necessary for him to use the freight elevator at the Department of Corrections. In addition, special transportation had to be arranged for JJ and LR. Doing so was very difficult and frustrating for the coordinators. Money was available for transportation, and the Board of Education agreed to arrange for the needed services. Both students who needed transportation had experiences of waiting hours for buses, not being picked up, and spending hours riding on the bus.

Friday seminars presented special problems, and LR had to leave early each Friday. Mid-semester JJ began using a cab for transportation to Friday seminars, which eliminated this problem for him. The only other modification necessary for these interns was the elimination of the use of the phone on the job for DD, ER and AM.

Dissemination

At the outset of the project, the coordinators put an ad on radio station WEVD in an effort to recruit handicapped students. They now plan to have additional radio spots and try to get write-ups in some papers. The coordinators believe that the sponsors they have in media will help them in their efforts. In addition, they will have an article in High Points, a New York City Board of Education newsletter.

Summary and Recommendations

In summary, it is important to point out that in spite of some major problems with transportation and job assignments, each of the handicapped students did profit from his/her experiences in the internship program. Each of them, with the possible exception of JJ, was able to develop positive relationships with non-handicapped co-workers both on a social and work level.

The lack of strong cooperation and support from the Division of Special Education and Pupil Personnel Services disappointed the coordinators. They feel now that it will be necessary for them to do their own recruitment and have no hope of gaining better cooperation from the Division.

The coordinators frequently asked questions about the students' handicaps. Need for more in-service training on handicapping conditions was expressed by

them; of particular value might have been a resource person available to answer the coordinators specific questions as the semester progressed.

If the project continues, transportation arrangements should be made well in advance as much as possible. In addition, every effort should be made to insure an executive placement for the interns. Further clarification of the target population is also essential if recruitment efforts are to be meaningful.

On-Site Visit - Orlando and Palm Beach, Florida

April 13, 14, 1978

General Overview

The greatest difficulty the coordinators in Orlando and Palm Beach found in their efforts to participate in the mainstreaming project seems to have been the constraints they felt were placed on the category "gifted handicapped." The major problem identified by both the coordinators and special education personnel was the State definition of gifted. Florida education regulations include the specification that any student labelled gifted must have an IQ at least two standard deviations above the mean on a standard measure of intelligence. In addition to the contraints created by this requirement, the two coordinators felt that to meet the criteria for handicapped established at the October meeting it would be necessary to have students with severe conditions. Therefore, the definition of "gifted handicapped" with which they were working was very limiting in and of itself.

Beyond these definitional constraints there were problems in the student identification process. It was noted that in Orlando, as well as in Palm Beach, any student performing at or above a normal level would either have long since been mainstreamed (and therfore no longer labelled handicapped and not on Special Education rolls) or have gone on to a special school after elementary school. The procedures used in attempting to locate gifted handicapped students for the EHIP project included contact with the head of the School Board's Gifted Program and running a computer search to identify blind, deaf or severly orthopedically handicapped high school seniors with IQ's of

100 or above. In Orlando, two students were identified. However, additional problems precluded their participation. Specifically, one student had a drug problem and her parents did not cooperate. The other student would have required an attendant for toileting. In West Palm Beach, one student was identified. However, that person was already involved in an outside activity which precluded full participation.

The constraints of the definition for "gifted handicapped" coupled with a short lead time in which to locate students and interest them in the internship program prevented these two coordinators from participating in the program. Both coordinators felt that for a project such as this additional lead time is essential in order to locate the students as well as to prepare them for the experience. Ms. Prather (Orlando) mentioned that given time, her plan for locating students would be quite different. She suggested that a formal presentation should be made at each of the county high schools as well as to appropriate organizations which serve the handicapped (e.g., Easter Seals). In addition, working closer with Human Resources Services and contacting the State School for Deaf and Blind in St. Augustine were suggested as possible means of locating students. Ms. Hogan (Palm Beach) emphasized personal contact in each school as a means of locating students. Since she had met with resistance from school administrators this would provide a means of recruitment without relying on administrator referrals.

In summary, redefining gifted and/or handicapped would increase the possibilities of locating suitable students for the program. Coupled with that redefinition should be sufficient lead time and personal contact with schools and agencies serving this population. These measures should help to increase the possibilities of locating students in Florida who could profit from the EHIP.

Debriefing Conference - Kansas City, Missouri

May 4, 5, 1978

The purpose of this conference was identified as to "talk about what happened." Specifically discussed were the October Plenary-Training Conference, and the project's implementation, with particular reference to the problems encountered. Anticipated as the outcome of the Debriefing Conference was content for an Adopters Handbook (i.e., information about how the project was carried out in general and about interns specifically).

In attendance at the meeting were the national director of EHIP, eight coordinators, from six cities, eight interns from five cities, and an outside evaluator.

Reports by Executive Interns

Each intern related his/her personal experiences in the program. They were all able to speak to the group and discuss the problems they had as well as the successes. As they spoke, it was apparent that the eight interns at the conference varied significantly in the severity of handicap and in their educational backgrounds. For some students, this internship was the first educational mainstreaming experience, while others received most of their schooling with non-handicapped persons. Therefore, the determination of a students degree of success in the program should be evaluated on an individual base rather than in comparison to the others. In addition, students with similar handicaps reported on some common problems encountered. For example, for the physically handicapped, transportation and physical access were the major obstacles, whereas the deaf students were unable to use telephones on the job.

One intern mentioned that although her placement had not been her first interest, she was satisfied with her internship. Another expressed dissatisfaction with his sponsor who was unwilling to let him try new assignments. The other interns at the conference seemed completely satisfied with their placements.

One intern originally scheduled to attend the conference was not permitted to do so because of her poor performance and minimal participation in the program throughout the semester.

Discussion

Later, project staff discussed the methods of implementation, problems in the implementation, solutions that were used, and possible action for the future. Methods of implementation generally involved contact with local special education personnel for student identification, and site placement after interviews (see Site Visit Reports).

Among the implementation problems described were minimal support and/or cooperation from special education personnel, handicapped students served out of district, truly gifted students already engaged in outside activities, constraints caused by the definition of gifted and handicapped, and the low incidence of the population which confounded several of the other problems. The State definition of gifted, as the major obstacle, prevented Florida's participation in the project. The definition of handicapped also raised questions when students had to be turned down because of the need to hire aides for them. Generally when coordinators had difficulty locating severely handicapped students willing to participate in the program, the less handicapped students were accepted.

Coordinators also mentioned a number of problems they had in working with the handicapped interns. The wide variations in their amount of mainstreaming experience and ability to socialize with non-handicapped persons led to the suggestion that these students might profit from pre-internship preparation and longer internships. Coordinators felt the need for information on dealing with the sponsors and non-handicapped interns in their relations with the handicapped interns and on how to maneuver wheelchairs. They discovered all buildings labelled "barrier free" were not. They found it necessary to make additional trips to sites when arranging the internships in order to ascertain whether the students could actually get to the placement.

Comments on Evaluation Procedures

Also expressed during the Debriefing Conference were general reactions to the Project's evaluation component. The Project staff questioned particularly the use of the Attitude Toward the Disabled Persons Scale and the Work Habits Profile. Agreement was reached on the elimination of the Work Habits Profile. However, other aspects of the evaluation design were to remain and the coordinators' cooperation was promised by the national director.

Were the coordinators' reactions to the evaluation instruments directly expressed to the evaluators when approval was requested in December 1977 or at sometime prior to the Debriefing Conference, some changes in the collection of quantitative data might have been effected. However, the instruments apparently continued to present difficulty after the Debriefing Conference, as evidenced by the failure to return completed forms, therefore limiting the quantitative analyses of the evaluation data. It should be noted, however, that the results of the statistical analyses that were done were generally consistent with the Site Visit findings.

Although there were some expressions of discomfort about the site visits, the coordinators in general expressed satisfaction with that component of the evaluation process. Most felt that they were able to describe their implementation of the Project although they would have appreciated more opportunity for consultation at the time of the visit. For the most part, they were pleased that the evaluators were able to witness their programs and to confer with their colleagues and with their handicapped interns.

Concluding Remarks

In spite of the many problems brought out during the discussion, it was felt that the project had been a good total experience. The interns related positive stories for the most part. In fact, they had assumed internships in a non-handicapped world of work, and had done so successfully. The most frequently cited obstacles were: 1) the identification of "gifted handicapped" individuals who could benefit from participation in the project and 2) parents and teachers were reluctant to permit handicapped students to participate. Not only were coordinators sensitive to their limited backgrounds in working with handicapped students; they were also concerned about sponsor and community reactions. Nevertheless, there was consensus among the coordinators that the program had been successful, and most certainly should be continued.

Conference Follow-Up

Five of the eight coordinators returned a conference follow-up questionnaire. On the questionnaire coordinators were asked to indicate whether they strongly agreed, somewhat agreed, agreed, somewhat disagreed, or strongly disagreed

with twelve statements about the conference. In general the responding coordinators were positive about the conference schedule, locale and transportation. Most also agreed that interns were given ample opportunities to discuss their experiences, however coordinators were not all in agreement about whether interns were made to feel relaxed and able to openly share their experiences with the group. Other questions concerned with group consensus of definitions of gifted and handicapped, and of criteria for intern selection produced scattered responses from the coordinators. Two of the questions included one response in each response category. Thus, it would seem that consensus was, in fact, not reached on these issues. However, four of the five responding coordinators did at least agree that problems as well as positive results were discussed adequately. Three of the five coordinators felt that dissemination activities were not adequately discussed, but most agreed that sufficient information had been presented to develop an Adopter's Handbook.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Intern Selection

Twelve high school students with handicapping conditions participated in the EHIP Mainstreaming Project. The handicapped students selected as participants manifested visual, orthopedic, or auditory impairments (see Table I).

TABLE I

Type and Severity of Handicapping Conditions of Interns

	Mild	Moderate	Severe	Total
Visually Handicapped		2		2
Orthopedically Handicapped	2	3	1	6
Hearing Impaired		1	3	4
TOTAL	2	6	4	12

The complexities of any handicapping condition make it difficult to place the interns into the categories of mild, moderate or severely handicapped. For the purposes of this project the following function-based paradigm was used:

1. Mild - a physical impairment which impacts minimally, if at all, on the student's ability to perform the tasks required in school, at the internship site, and for the group seminar;
2. Moderate - a physical impairment which required special modifications (e.g., use of magnifier, attention to lighting) to allow the student to participate fully;

3. Severe - a physical impairment which requires both compensatory modifications and continued remedial intervention (e.g., language training, continued enrollment in a special class or school).

The six districts (9 Coordinators) which participated (i.e., recruited handicapped interns) in the Mainstreaming Project utilized a broad definition of gifted in selecting both handicapped and non-handicapped interns. Criteria included special creative or leadership talents in addition to academic achievement levels and intellectual aptitude. In only one district was a gifted handicapped student selected through the usual intern recruitment procedure. While there was some local variation, most districts worked with or through a Special Education Department or other administrative unit. Student nominations were requested from special teachers and counselors, interviews were held with applicants, and final selections were made.

In all districts the pool of potential interns who were both gifted and handicapped was exceedingly small. In the majority of cases these students who met the district's criteria for program participation, had previous or current mainstream experience, and generally resembled their non-handicapped peers on demographic variables (see Tables II, III). Three of the New York City participants had received all of their schooling in special schools or classes. Data supplied by the students in participating districts indicated that a majority of non-handicapped interns had grades of either A or B. Eight of the twelve handicapped interns had grade averages comparable to those of their peers. Handicapped interns also fell within the average range on demographic variables of age and attitude toward disabled persons. There was wide variability in the reasons for which the non-handicapped students elected to participate in the EHIP. This variability was also evidenced by the handicapped students. In fact, the one distinguishing characteristic shown by the disabled interns was the lack of previous work experience (see Table IV).

TABLE II

Sex and Age of Interns

	Handicapped			Nonhandicapped		
Age	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
17	1	1	2	7	12	19
18	1	4	5	61	90	151
19	2	1	3	8	4	12
20+	1	1	2	--	--	--
TOTAL	5	7	12	76	106	182

TABLE III

Race of Interns

	Handicapped		Nonhandicapped	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Black	3	25	51	29
Hispanic	1	8	4	2
Oriental	-	-	7	4
White	8	67	112	65
TOTAL	12	100	174	100

TABLE IV

Previous Work Experience of Interns

	Yes	No
Handicapped	6	6
Nonhandicapped	157	17
TOTAL	163	23

At the end of the recruitment period, there were only two incidences of forced selection which resulted in the inclusion of handicapped pupils whose measured intellectual ability and alternate special abilities were below those expected of non-disabled gifted interns. In two cases a prospective intern was not included because he was "too handicapped." One district was unable to find handicapped students who met the stated criteria for gifted in the State and, therefore, postponed participation the Mainstreaming Project.

Learner Objectives

Intern Performance

The majority of handicapped participants followed the usual interview process, speaking with several potential sponsors in their field of interest. In a minority of cases the handicapped were not given the option of interviewing with several sponsors (see program descriptions, Buffalo, Sacramento, and New York). As might have been predicted, two of the handicapped interns requested placements in special education. In deeping with the guidelines set by the national consortium, these interns were directed into the exploration of other career opportunities.

In general, interns were placed with either professional service providers on top-level management. For the Mainstreaming Project, five handicapped interns

were sponsored by a service professional and seven were sponsored by management. The format and requirements for the semester project varied by district, as did the expectation for ongoing contribution to the home school. The organization and format of Friday seminars was influenced by the needs, interest, and abilities of the students within a school district. Content focused on career alternatives and management skills. Simulation games, case studies, and presentations by community resource persons were techniques used by most programs.

Regardless of the differences shown among local school districts, it should be remembered that within any district the expectations for interns with physical disabilities were equal to the performance expectations for non-disabled peers to be supported by data from end-of-term inventory.

The end-of-term inventory was completed by interns in five of the nine seminar groups. Unfortunately, inventories were received from only four of the twelve interns with handicapping conditions. The responses of these four students parallelled those of their non-handicapped peers on the majority of the sixty-eight items. The following discrepencies were noted.

1. More than 90% of the non-disabled interns felt that they had been moderately or very well prepared for the employer interviews. In contrast, only 50% of the handicapped interns who responded felt similarly.
2. While only 50% of the non-disabled students indicated that the weekly seminars related to the issues being faced in the field, all four handicapped respondants gave similar answers.
3. A greater percentage of handicapped than of non-handicapped interns indicated that the logs were of benefit to them.
4. A greater percentage of interns with handicapping conditions indicated that previous classroom training had prepared them very well for the internship experience.

5. While most non-handicapped interns engaged in some form of research, three of the four responding handicapped interns indicated that they had not been so engaged.
6. Coordinators had made contact with the parents of all handicapped interns while parent contact had been established with only a small number of parents of able-bodied interns.
7. Three of the four special project interns indicated that they would make changes in the EHIP but none explained their answer. (The majority of non-handicapped interns indicated that they would not make changes in the program.)
8. Half of the handicapped respondants indicated that they missed-out by not having been in school during the project's semester. Only one third of the non-handicapped interns responded similarly.

On-site interviews and end-of-term evaluations by sponsors and coordinators indicated that with one exception, handicapped interns were able to fulfill all requirements of the internship. The local implementation team agreed that the one student who performed inadequately did not have the requisite skills for successful program participation and should not have been recruited into the executive internship. Variations in performance were evidenced, but these appeared to be within normal limits and unrelated to primary handicapping conditions.

Non-Disabled Participants

It was anticipated that as a result of the project, non-handicapped students would show an increased "level of comfort relating to handicapped

students" (See Appendix B - Learner Objectives). In addition to on-site observations the Attitude Toward Disabled Persons Scale (Yuker, 1966) was administered at the beginning of the project and again at the end.

Both pre- and post-test scores were available from 80 interns representing five seminar groups. A *t* test for correlated observations showed no significant change ($p < .05$) in ATDP scores for this sample. However, since the 80 students represent less than half the number of participating interns a viable interpretation of these findings is not possible.

Process Objectives

Coordinator Objectives

Site visits to local districts verified that coordinators were working toward increasing their ability to relate to the needs of the handicapped. All coordinators made contact with a special education/rehabilitation specialist and were using that person as a source of information regarding needed support services for interns currently in the project. In addition, the groundwork was being laid in several places for meeting the needs of next year's potential interns.

Pre- and post-test measures were also used to determine how close the project came to meeting this objective. Only four of the 12 coordinators returned both the pre- and post-test instruments. In all four cases a change in a positive direction was noted. However, a one-tailed *t* test for correlated observations shows that this change was not statistically significant ($p < .05$). It is suspected that the small number of respondants effected the results negatively.

The Attitude Toward Disabled Person Scale (ATDP) was utilized as a measure of coordinator responsiveness to the abilities of the handicapped. Pre- and post-test scores were available for five coordinators. Although four of these five showed positive change in scores upon completion of the Mainstreaming Project, t test analysis showed no statistically significant difference in scores.

Organizational Development

As mentioned previously, the majority of the process objectives were related to the consortium itself. One of these process objectives concerned the development of an organization to facilitate deliverance of the project's commitments. Included as sub-sections of this goal were: clarification and consensus on objectives, specification of roles and responsibilities of consortium members, development of a work plan with a timetable, cooperation with the evaluation process, and creation of a system for internal communication and information sharing.

Evaluation of the consortium organization occurred by matching the processes outlined at the plenary-training sessions with actual occurrences at field sites. The reader is referred to the Process Objectives (pp. 5-9) for a more comprehensive evaluation of this area.

Development of a Support System

In accordance with the objectives set by the consortium, successful partipation of handicapped interns was to be facilitated through the development of a resource system which could accommodate special needs. In all districts except New York City the support system which was developed relied heavily

upon special education persons from the local school system.

The special students chosen for the Mainstreaming Project showed moderate or severe impairments in visual, auditory or motor function. Most were able to function independently at their field placements. Architectural barriers made it necessary for two interns to have on-site assistance in moving through their work sites. Two potential interns who would have required extensive program support (i.e., a full-time aide) were not allowed to participate since it was felt that the resources in those districts could not support the special needs of these students.

In general, special modifications necessary to accommodate this pilot group of handicapped interns revolved around special transportation needs. Where possible local boards of education rearranged bus pick-up to accommodate field placements. However, changing seminar locations and a school day which extended beyond the three o'clock hour created difficulties in several cases. The problem in New York City was so severe that two interns were significantly delayed in starting the program. Although funds should have been available for handling such experiences, coordinators seemed uncertain as to the mechanism for tapping into the $300 per student which was to be made available through the EHIP national office.

It should be noted that with the exception of New York City both coordinators and interns had access to support from special education guidance counselors and teachers. Special skills training (e.g., speech therapy, mobility orientation, personal dress and hygiene) was provided as necessary.

One New York City sponsor was actively involved in efforts to eliminate architectural barriers at his placement site. It appeared that the varied location of seminar sites and the need to evaluate architectural accessibility

of each site produced increased awareness of physical barriers in those groups with a participant in a wheelchair.

Expanded Placement Opportunities

Dissemination efforts directed at mainstreaming varied across school districts but appeared to be directly tied to public relations plans for the EHIP as a whole. The very existence of the project has fostered an increased awareness of the ability of handicapped students to participate in what is an important and on-going aspect of the education program offered by the participating school districts.

In two of the participating districts (Compton, and Buffalo) specific efforts were being directed toward increasing the pool of sponsors who had previous experience with or currently hire handicapped employees. In addition to expanding the number of available placements it was felt that these sites could provide handicapped interns with supplementary role models thereby increasing the value of the placement. In one district this was being effected through the coordinator's interaction with the city's Advisory Council on the Handicapped. In the second case a sponsor was playing a major role through his company's community interface program.

The original evaluation design called for pre- and post-test administration of the ATDP as a measure of change in sponsor attitudes. However, the limited number of responses made limited the value of this analysis. A greater number of sponsors completed the EHIP End-of-Term Inventory. Examination of the responses to the 43 items indicated that sponsors of interns with handicapping conditions were as satisfied with the overall processes of the program as were sponsors of the non-handicapped interns. Opportunities provided to

interns and the new skills learned by them appeared to be consistent across both groups of students.

Local School District Project Continuation

In all districts local school personnel expressed support for mainstreaming handicapped gifted youngsters into the EHIP. With variations support was demonstrated through the provision of special transportation, special education counselors, evaluation of architectural accessibility, and ancillary therapy needs.

The pool of severely handicapped gifted students with previous or current mainstreaming experience was limited in all districts. It is suspected, however, that dissemination efforts during this pilot project will result in a small increase in the number of potential interns with handicapping conditions who are nominated.

With only one exception, the local education agencies felt that, if necessary, special accommodations needed by individual interns could be funded through departments of special education, pupil personnel services, or vocational rehabilitation. In no district did a system currently exist for tapping additional monies to meet individual needs of handicapped students. Standard procedures should be developed to facilitate meeting special needs.

End Note

In conclusion it can be stated that with the expception of one internship the Mainstreaming Project was successful. Handicapped interns were able to compete successfully with non-handicapped peers in independent world-of-work situations. In addition, for the most part they were able to integrate fully

into the seminar setting. Only one of the participating sponsors expressed reluctance to work with a handicapped intern in the future. Several expressed the desire to see the program extended.

Similarly, local school district personnel were in favor of program continuance. The Mainstreaming Project appears to have resulted in an awareness among nominators that handicapped youngsters can and should participate in the already well established internship program. As greater numbers of handicapped youngsters are mainstreamed into regular classrooms, the pool of available handicapped interns should increase. One would hope that there will be concomitant increase in the number of nominations coming through regular high school channels and a decrease in the need for coordinators to make special efforts to find gifted handicapped interns.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In spite of problems faced by local coordinators the EHIP Mainstreaming Project was a worthwhile pilot of benefit to both the current and future interns with physical impairments. It should be recognized that while the internship program has been in operation for a number of years, the number of interns with handicapping conditions was limited. This one semester project has clearly demonstrated that high school students with physical impairments can successfully participate in this field experience, meeting the expectations established for non-disabled peers.

For the purposes of evaluating the Mainstreaming Project the evaluators relied upon the process and product/learner objectives disseminated to implementation teams after the Plenary-Training Workshop held in Orlando in November 1978. After examining general program characteristics and learner outcomes the following recommendations are made.

1. A new handbook should be prepared for use by EHIP coordinators to provide them with information related to:
   a. Special needs of teenagers with visual, auditory, and orthopedic impairments;
   b. Voluntary health agencies available to assist children with physical impairments;
   c. Sources of public funds which might be used to accommodate the special needs of handicapped interns.
2. Forced selection of handicapped interns should be avoided at all costs. Selecting a handicapped EHIP participant even when no appropriate candidate is available appears to result in undue amounts of time spent trying to provide special accommodations for youngsters who would ordinarily

not meet the criteria for program admission.

3. The EHIP should assess its commitment to integrating severely handicapped students into the internship program. If active recruitment of such students is to be undertaken, attention should be paid to:
   a. Contact between EHIP coordinators and ninth/tenth grade teachers of the handicapped with an aim toward identificating potential candidates and providing these severely impaired youngsters with the prerequisite experiences for success as interns.
   b. Sources of local, state and/or federal monies which might be used to provide special accommodations;
   c. Increased man-hours needed if the EHIP coordinator is to integrate the efforts of the multidisciplinary treatment team providing services to the severely handicapped with the EHIP implementation team.
4. Preparation of a project bulletin would undoubtedly facilitate necessary exchange of information among district coordinators.
5. Each district participating in a special project should submit its own operational plan based upon the districts' academic calendar.
6. The concerns of and techniques employed by individual program coordinators should be included as on-going input on programming and management. They should be incorporated into any future evaluation systems for EHIP. Utilization of local evaluation teams should bring about more effective process evaluation by allowing for:
   a. Joint development of criteria against which local programs can be audited;

b. An increased number of site visits providing continuous feedback regarding learner progress as well as overall process.

7. Project evaluation of a highly quantitative nature requires the development of more appropriate instrumentation. Failure of otherwise cooperative, active and obviously committed project staff to return completed forms suggests time constraints, difficulty in responding to items, lack of confidence that change over a few months time will be significant and/or a challenge to personal competence. The materials employed were essentially modifications of those used with non-disabled interns as described in the project proposal. Standardized instruments currently do not measure the expected outcomes, and standardization of the instruments used could not have been done in the few weeks available between the clarification of project objectives at the Orlando meeting and the forwarding of the evaluation packets for school district approval before the Christmas vacation.

8. The completed pilot project has demonstrated through on-site observations and personal interviews with interns, coordinators, administrators, sponsors, and parents, as well as through minimal statistical analysis of data, the feasibility of integrating mildly and moderately handicapped students into the executive internship program. It is therefore suggested that the national office work toward expanding this mainstreaming aspect to participating districts not included in the special project.

9. Using this pilot as an example, special funding might not be essential to the incorporation of the mildly, moderately and even the severely impaired. However, at this time it is recommended that the national

office receive support to coordinate efforts between local EHIP personnel and state and local special education teams.

10. A combined effort to utilize already existing resources (both personnel and funds) should increase the number of qualified physically handicapped youngsters who are able to participate in the Executive High School Internships Program.

APPENDIX A

Plenary-Training Workshop Follow-Up

APPENDIX A

Plenary-Training Workshop (Oct. 27-31, 1977)
Follow-up Questionnaire

	Percent of Total Who:					
	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
Organization facilitated meeting conference objectives	40	40	20			
Consensus reached on learner objectives	40	20	40			
Consensus reached on process objectives	20	20	60			
Coordinator responsibility defined	20		80			
Sponsor responsibility defined	20	20	60			
Special educators responsibility defined	20		60	20		
School administrators role defined	20		40	40		
National office responsibility defined	20	20	60			
Evaluator roles defined	20	20	60			
USOE project officer's role defined	40			40		20
Consensus reached on criteria for intern selection	20		60	20		
Consensus reached on criteria for sponsor selection	20		60	20		
Public relations responsibilities defined		20	60	20		20
Process for communication established		20	80			
Usefulness of discussions on needs of the handicapped	40	20	40			

Executive High School Internships of America
Mainstreaming Gifted Handicapped Project
Plenary-Training Workshop (Oct. 27-29, 1977)

Conference Follow-up Questionnaire

Name _____ District _____

Date _____

For each item, circle the number that best fits your response.
1= strongly agree; 2= somewhat agree; 3= agree; 4= somewhat disagree; 5= strongly disagree; 6= no opinion. If you gave any further comments, please use the space provided at the end.

	strongly agree	somewhat agree	agree	somewhat disagree	strongly disagree	no opinion
The organization (i.e. meeting time schedule, physical plant, hand-outs) of the Plenary-Training Workshop facilitiated meeting the objectives of the conference.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Consensus was reached regarding learner objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Consensus was reached regarding process objectives (i.e. approach to career education for handicapped talented students).	1	2	3	4	5	6
Roles and responsibilities of local coordinators were clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Roles and responsibilities of sponsors were clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Roles and responsibilities of special education staff were clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Roles and responsibilities of local school administrators were clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Roles and resonsibilities of national office staff were clearly defind.	1	2	3	4	5	6

	strongly agree	somewhat agree	agree	somewhat disagree	strongly disagree	no opinion
Roles and responsibilities of third party evaluators were clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Roles and responsibilities of the U.S.O.E. project officer were clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Consensus was reached on the criteria for selection of interns.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Consensus was reached on the criteria for sponsor selection.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Public relations responsibilities of the participants were specified.	1	2	3	4	5	6
A process for communication among national staff, coordinators and evaluators was established.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Discussions related to the special needs of handicapped interns were helpful.	1	2	3	4	5	6

List the principal objectives toward which the mainstreaming project is directed.

On the basis of the stated objectives do you feel that your district's program has any additional objectives which should be evaluated? If so please specify.

On the basis of increased knowledge of high school students with handicapping conditions, do you anticipate any special problems in implementing the project in your district? If so please specify.

APPENDIX B

Selection Criteria and Objectives

APPENDIX B*

Selection Criteria

Gifted

Emphasis will be placed on identifying students whose particular gifts cannot be developed in the ordinary school program. Such gifts will include:

1. Intellectual giftedness
2. Leadership and administrative talent
3. General academic aptitude
4. Creative or productive thinking

Gifted handicapped students will be identified through any two of the following avenues:

1. Self or parent nominations
2. Peer nominations
3. Nomination by a community leader
4. Faculty and staff nominations
5. Inclusion in the student's individual education plan of a recommendation that significant time be spent in regular education programming activity, if possible in the community.
6. (where appropriate) Scores on achievement, intelligence, and other tests, provided they are appropriate for use with handicapped students.

Handicapped

Priority will be placed on three areas of handicapping: (1) Visual impairment, from legally to totally blind; (2) Hearing impaired--from hard of hearing to totally deaf; and (3) Orthopedic impairment. In all instances, we will seek students with severe impairments who have had sufficient successful mainstream experience to be able to benefit from the program.

*Selection criteria, learner objectives and process objectives were developed by the National Consortium and formed the base upon which evaluation of the EHIP Mainstreaming Project took place.

Learner Objectives

The overall objective of this project is that gifted handicapped students will function effectively as an integral part of the Executive High School Internships Program and achieve the same learning outcomes as the other students in the program. In order to achieve this, however, it will be necessary for the project to direct its efforts toward the learner-oriented goals listed below.

1. Gifted handicapped students will achieve an expanded level of self-awareness and personal growth, as evidenced variously by their:

   a. Raising their expectations of their own performance in the program;
   b. Developing a more realistic understanding of their own abilities, interests, and skills relative to career opportunities at the administrative and executive levels;
   c. Developing increased self-confidence and poise in world-of-work situations.

2. Gifted handicapped students will demonstrate increased competence in coping with world-of-work situations--specifically, an increased ability to succeed as a functional independent away from the insular, self-contained classroom.

3. Non-handicapped students will gain an increased appreciation for and level of comfort to handicapped students.

Process Objectives

1. Coordinators will increase their ability to relate to the needs of gifted handicapped students. This will be evidenced by their:

   a. Expanded level of information about the nature of handicapping conditions and about available support services;
   b. Expanded understanding of the needs of gifted handicapped students.

2. The consortium will develop an effective organization to deliver on the program's commitments by:

   a. Clarifying objectives and reaching consensus on them,
   b. Specifying roles and responsibilities of all members,
   c. Developing a muturally agreed upon work plan with timetable for implementation,
   d. Cooperating with the evaluation process,
   e. Creating a system for internal communication and information sharing.

3. The consortium will develop a support system for assisting interns in relating effectively to their placements. This will be achieved through:

   a. Identifying supplementary role models among handicapped and non-handicapped executives who can expand upon interns' learning in the program;
   b. Generating a bank of resources (public and private, non-profit and profit agencies) that can provide supportive services to students;
   c. Encouraging the removal of architectural barriers at placement sites.

4. The consortium will expand the number and variety of placement opportunities open to gifted handicapped students.

5. Districts in the consortium will develop a system for ensuring that the project will continue beyond the funding period.

APPENDIX C

Evaluation Packet Sent to Coordinators

Site Visit Guide

Debriefing Conference - Follow-Up

TEACHERS COLLEGE COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10027

TO: Coordinators, Executive High School Internships of America

FROM: Frances Connor and Joan Baken

SUBJECT: Evaluation design to be shared with your district's Office of Research

DATE: December 20, 1977

The enclosed packet defines the evaluation plan, including data collection instruments, which will be used to measure the extent to which the objectives of the Mainstreaming Handicapped Gifted Students Project have been accomplished.

As discussed at the Plenary-Training Workshop we are relying on you to review this information and present it to your school district's Office of Research for approval. Once approved we can begin distribution of evaluation materials.

EVALUATION PACKET SENT TO COORDINATORS

Executive High School Internships of America
Mainstreaming Gifted Handicapped Project

EVALUATION DESIGN

Assessment of the impact of the mainstreaming project will focus on its effects on participants; students, sponsors, coordinators, school personnel, and Consortium members. General program characteristics will be examined to determine feasibility of program expansion/replication. In concert with the program's learner outcome and process objectives, the evaluation will respond to questions such as the following: What changes have taken place in program participants after exposure to program variables? Have there been any negative effects on participants? How well has the operational plan been implemented? What problems have prevented total implementation? How well has the Consortium been operated?

What special services are needed to facilitate full participation by handicapped interns?

To answer these and other questions, the evaluation design will incorporate the following:

1. Measurement of changes in program--related attitudes of student participants.
2. Measurement of changes in program--related attitudes of sponsors and coordinators.
3. Assessment of students' performance in placements, familiarity with career and organizational variables, and classroom articulation activities.
4. Observation of Consortium workshops and conferences.
5. Inspection of Consortium records.
6. On-site interviews with a sample of program participants and Consortium members.

The Department of Special Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, under the chairmanship of Dr. Frances Connor, will serve as third party evaluator. Teachers College will assume responsibility for conducting the project evaluation, in terms of both the operation of the Consortium and the program's effectiveness at individual sites. To these ends the College will:

1. Monitor local evaluation activities to make certain that sound evaluation procedures are being used.
2. Participate in the Plenary-Training Workshop of the Consortium to train members in evaluation procedures.
3. Make visits to each project site to:
   a. Determine the extent to which the project has been implemented as planned.
   b. Review evaluation activities of local districts.
   c. Conduct interviews with selected project participants and others involved in the project.
4. Review project reports and documents to determine the extent to which the Consortium objectives have been met.
5. Prepare a final report.

All pre-post-test instruments will be administered by the Coordinators and the Consortium school districts' research and evaluation offices whose time will constitute an inkind contribution to the project. Instruments will be supplied to each project site by the National Consortium staff. Clear instructions will be included for test administration of all instruments, separate analyses will be

performed for each of the identified student groups (i.e. handicapped interns, non-handicapped interns). In addition, the groups will be compared to each other. Interviews will be conducted to amplify the analysis of data.

EVALUATION PLAN

LEARNER OBJECTIVE	INDICATOR	INSTRUMENTS/TECHNIQUES	COMPLETED BY:
A. Students will develop greater familiarity with career opportunities at executive levels in organizations.	(1) Knowledge of existing and and projected job opportunities	Seminar-Project Check List	Coordinator Sponsor
B. Students will develop greater self-awareness regarding career goals, abilities, interests, and attitudes	(1) Greater self-confidence	Michigan Student Index	Interns
	(2) Greater awareness of skills, abilities, interests		Interns
	(3) Greater sense of personal preferences for particular work situations	Career Development Inventory	Interns
		Interviews with random sample of interns & site visit	Third party evaluator
C. Students will demonstrate work habits necessary for effective employment in the world of work in organizations.	(1) promptness, appearance, dependability, discretion, sensitivity, independence, accuracy, maturity, creativity, attitude, perseverance	Work Habits Profile	Interns Sponsors Coordinators
		On-Site Interview	
		End-of-Term Inventory	Third party evaluator Sponsor
D. Students will develop a more accurate understanding of how organizations function and the roles of managers and executives who lead them.	(1) Formal and informal roles	Seminar-Project Check List	Coordinator Sponsor
	(2) Need for priorities		
	(3) Decision-making processes	End-of-Term Inventory	Interns
	(4) Scope of executive position		

LEARNER OBJECTIVE	INDICATOR	INSTRUMENTS/TECHNIQUES	COMPLETED BY:
	(5) Requisite skills, knowledge for administration		
	(6) Constraints on management		
	(7) Change strategies		
	(8) Critical issues in the field		
		Interviews with random sample of interns & site visit	Third party evaluator
E. Non-handicapped gifted and talented participants will exhibit positive attitudes toward handicapped participants in the program.	(1) Express appreciation for talents of handicapped participants.	ATDP	Interns
	(2) Recognize that handicapped participants can hole leadership roles in the world of work on equal basis with non-handicapped leaders.	Interviews with random sample of/interns and site visit	Third party evaluator

PROCESS OBJECTIVE	INDICATOR	INSTRUMENTS/TECHNIQUES	COMPLETED BY:
A. The Consortium districts will demonstrate more effective linkages with world of work organizations and institutions in their local communities.	(1) Employer satisfaction with program and teacher-coordinator support	End-of-Term Inventory I	Sponsors
		Interviews with sample of employers and school district & site visit personnel	Third party evaluator
B. The Consortium will demonstrate a more comprehensive approach to career education in articulation with the academic curriculum.	(1) Inclusion of program in district's course of study as part of academic curriculum		
	(2) District awarding credit in standard subject areas	Interviews with sample of principals, department chairmen, and teachers; site visits	Third party evaluator

PROCESS OBJECTIVE	INDICATOR	INSTRUMENTS/TECHNIQUES	COMPLETED BY:
	(3) Student participation in school feedback activities, e.g., curriculum development, teaching, tutoring, counseling, briefings		
	(4) Support of articulation component and credit policy by principals, department chairman, and teachers		
C. The Consortium of participating school systems will strengthen the project by facilitating the training of program staff, exchange of program information and resources, assessment of program activities, and communication of results to the worlds of education and work and the general public.	(1) Organization and delivery of a planning and training workshop, a Product & Development Seminar for Consortium members.	Observation of 2 conferences Plenary-Training Workshop Questionnaire	Third party evaluator
	(2) Publication and distribution of Project Bulletins to Consortium members.	Inspection of records	Third party evaluator
	(3) Communication with national, regional and state resources of value	Inspection of records	Third party evaluator
	(4) Distribution of program information through a national newsletter and publications of various organizations.	Inspection of records	Third party evaluator
	(5) Generating requests for program information from non-member districts.	Inspection of records	Third party evaluator

PROCESS OBJECTIVE	INDICATOR	INSTRUMENTS/TECHNIQUES	COMPLETED BY:
D. Employers will exhibit positive attitudes toward the mainstreamed handicapped gifted and talented participants.	(1) Hold the same expectations of all participants in the program, both handicapped and non-handicapped.	Work Habits Profile	Sponsors
		ATDP	Sponsors Coordinators
	(2) Express positive reactions to the talents of handicapped participants		
	(3) Provide an internship placement which meets standard program requirements.	End-of-Term Inventory II	Interns
		Interviews with random sample of sponsors & interns site visit	Third party evaluator

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

The data collection instruments used in this evaluation will be given to interns, sponsors and/or coordinators. In addition site visits will include interviews with these persons as well as with parents and school officials. Certain of the instruments will be administered only once (at either the initiation or the termination of the program). Others will be given twice: pre- and post-program implementation.

In selecting instruments for use with interns the basic considerations were the suitability of the instrument for use with youngsters varying widely in the degree and nature of their sensory and/or motor limitations and the need for flexibility in administration to provide maximum opportunity for satisfactory performance. In selecting instruments to be used with sponsors and coordinators emphasis was placed upon the need to gather as much information as possible with the least disruption of daily routine.

Intern Completed Instruments

Pre-project Administration

Demographic Data Questionnaire. The demographic questionnaire solicits general information relative to the intern's social-educational history. Also included are items related to the intern's knowledge of and experience with physical impairment.

Pre- and Post-project Administration

Attitude Toward Disabled Person Scale (ATDP). The ATDP assesses the attitudes of non-handicapped individuals toward the handicapped and of the handicapped toward themselves.

Work Habits Profile. Completed by the intern as well as by the sponsor the Work Habits Profile assesses such dimensions as promptness, appearance and dependability (i.e. work related characteristics which relate to the Memorandum of Understanding).

Personal Performance Assessment. This tool will measure any changes in the interns' expectation of their own performance in internship related tasks.

Ability, Interest, and Skill Inventory. This tool will assess the interns' understanding of their own abilities, interests, and skills in given professions at all levels.

Post-project Administration

End-of-Term Inventory. This tool assesses the interns' evaluations of the executive internship program. It explores reactions to program organization, field placement, articulation with the home school, etc.

Sponsor Completed Instruments

Pre- and Post-project Administration

Attitude Toward Disabled Person Scale (ATDP). The ATDP assesses the attitudes of non-handicapped individuals toward the handicapped.

Post-project Administration

Work Habits Profile. This tool will be used to measure the sponsors evaluation of work habits demonstrated by the intern.

Seminar and Project Check List. This instrument is to be used as a tool to assist observers in rating the intern's seminar presentation and/or term projects. Categories of information included on the list correspond to the performance objectives of the program.

End-of-Term Inventory. The End-of-Term Inventory taps the sponsor's impression of the internship program. It explores general program objectives, intern preparation, sponsor-intern interaction, etc.

Coordinator Completed Instruments

Pre- and Post-project Administration

Special Education Information Scale. This scale will determine changes in the level of information displayed by the coordinator about the nature of handicapping conditions and about available support services.

Conference Follow-up Questionnaires. Each of two project conferences will be followed by a questionnaire intended to measure consensus regarding those goals established by national office staff for the conference.

Attitude Toward Disabled Person Scale (ATDP). The ATDP will be used to assess the attitude of non-handicapped individuals toward handicapped persons.

Work Habits Profile. Coordinators will use this tool to evaluate change in work habits demonstrated by the intern.

Post-project Administration

Seminar and Project Check List. This tool will be used to rate the intern's performance on the seminar presentation and/or term project. Information rated corresponds to the stated performance objectives of the program.

On-Site Interviews

Even with data from all of the instruments described, a totally statistical analysis may miss the flavor of the program and over-look unexpected reasons for the success or failure of this undertaking. Moreover, broader questions, such as the following, should be addressed: How are the various program components functioning in relation to its indigenous environment? Has the program met stated

project goals but still overlooked some very significant areas? What factors have influenced the program's achievement of objectives? What problems related to handicapping conditions seem to recur?

In order to provide a fuller description of how the program functions in actual practice, the third party evaluator will observe the program in operation and interview a sample of participants. A sample of interns (both handicapped and non-handicapped) will be interviewed to determine the following: (1) how they have been utilized in placements; (2) whether difficulties have been encountered in gaining acceptance from sponsors and staff and, if so, whether problems have been resolved; (3) reasons for choosing placements, how those choices relate to career goals, and how the latter have been affected by the experience; (4) how perceptions of organizations and executives that have been modified through the program.

Sponsors will be interviewed about many of the same items including: (1) intern's activities; (2) reactions to the selection process and reasons for choosing particular students, including handicapped interns; (3) degree of satisfaction with interns' performance; (4) level of agreement with program goals; (5) placement activities designed in pursuit of those goals and assessment of whether interns have attained them; (6) problems related to the handicapping condition of the intern; and; (7) level of satisfaction with teacher-coordinator support.

Interviews with a sample of principals, school board officials, teachers and parents will probe the following variables: (1) level of satisfaction with program; (2) role of students in school utilization component; (3) level of support for program goals and academic credit policy; (4) satisfaction with Coordinator support; (5) reaction to feedback from students; and (6) perceptions of problems and recommendations for modification.

From Coordinators the third party evaluator will gather information about (1) support provided by the school administration at the central office and high school levels; (2) cooperation received from sponsors; (3) interns' experience in placements, including particularly exemplary experiences as well as those failing to meet program expectations; (4) community resources for supplemental services which have been developed for the handicapped; (5) degree of success with dissemination activities; (6) assessment of seminars (a seminar will also be observed); (7) obstacles to fulfillment of program objectives; (8) requirements for additional help; and (9) recommendations for improvement.

INTERN

Executive High School Internship of America
Mainstreaming Project

Student Demographic Data Questionnaire

Name: _____

Date: _____ Date of Birth: _____ (Month) _____ (Day) _____ (Year)

A. Present School grade level

1. ☐ 9th grade
2. ☐ 10th grade
3. ☐ 11th grade
4. ☐ 12th grade

B. Sex

1. ☐ Male
2. ☐ Female

C. Race/Ethnic origin

1. ☐ Black
2. ☐ White
3. ☐ Oriental
4. ☐ Hispanic
5. ☐ American Indian
6. ☐ Other (specify) _____

D. Do you have a handicap?

1. ☐ Yes
2. ☐ No

E. If yes, is it due to

1. ☐ Physical disability
2. ☐ Deafness(Hearing Impairment)
3. ☐ Visual Handicap
4. ☐ Other (specify)_____

F. Were you born with it?

1. ☐ Yes
2. ☐ No

Did you attend a special program?

1. ☐ Yes
2. ☐ No

If yes, in which kind of special program and for how many years. Indicate below:

1. ☐ School for Deaf ___ yes
2. ☐ School for Blind ___ yes
3. ☐ School for Physically Handicap ___ yes
4. ☐ Special Class in an Elementary High School ___ yes
5. ☐ Regular Class with some assistance from a special teacher ___ yes

G. Which of the following is closest to your letter grade average over the last year in school?

1. ☐ F (0.0-0.49)
2. ☐ D (0.5-1.49)
3. ☐ C (1.5-2.49)
4. ☐ B (2.5-3.49)
5. ☐ A (3.5-4.00)
6. ☐ Not Sure

J. What is the highest level of formal education completed by your mother?

1. ☐ Elementary school
2. ☐ Junior High school
3. ☐ Some high school training
4. ☐ High school diploma
5. ☐ Some college training
6. ☐ College degree
7. ☐ Some graduate school training
8. ☐ Graduate school degree
9. ☐ Other (specify)_____

K. Have you had previous work experience?

1. ☐ Yes
2. ☐ No

If yes, were you ever a volunteer worker?

1. ☐ Yes
2. ☐ No

If yes, were you ever paid?

1. ☐ Yes
2. ☐ No

FOR THE LAST TWO QUESTIONS THAT FOLLOW USE ANSWERS FROM THE OCCUPATION SCALE ON THE LAST PAGE OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

L. From the list in the OCCUPATION SCALE which category best describes the work done by your father or male guardian?

Category Number ____
If 11 (Other), please explain._____

M. From the list in the OCCUPATION SCALE which category best describes the work done by your mother or female guardian?

Category Number____
If 11 (Other), please explain._____

H. From the following rank the first (1), second (2) and third (3) most important reasons why you applied for The Executive High School Internship Program.

1. ☐ To receive counseling about what to do after I finish school
2. ☐ To have more individiual attention in my school program
3. ☐ To find out about careers
4. ☐ To have learning activities outside of the school
5. ☐ To get into a program different from regular school
6. ☐ To get help in finding a job
7. ☐ To make new friends
8. ☐ To get job training
9. ☐ Other (explain)_____

I. What is the highest level of formal education completed by your father?

1. ☐ Elementary school
2. ☐ Junior High School
3. ☐ Some high school training
4. ☐ High school diploma
5. ☐ Some college training
6. ☐ College degree
7. ☐ Some graduate school training
8. ☐ Graduate school degree
9. ☐ Other (specify)_____

OCCUPATION SCALE

1. CLERICAL AND SALES WORKERS, TECHNICIANS, AND OWNERS OF LITTLE BUSINESSES. Examples: bank teller, business machine operator, sales clerk, draftsman, dental technician, newstand owner, tailor shop owner, secretary, receptionist.

2. HIGHER EXECUTIVES, PROPRIETORS OF LARGE CONCERNS, AND MAJOR PROFESSIONALS. Examples: bank president, judge, executive director, city manager, department store owner, accountant, doctor, lawyer, military command officer.

3. ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, SMALL INDEPENDENT BUSINESS OWNERS, AND MINOR PROFESSIONALS. Examples: insurance agent, store manager, car dealer, bakery shop owner, gas station owner, photographer, military non-commissioned officer, newspaper reporter, travel agent.

4. UNSKILLED EMPLOYEES. Examples: cafeteria worker, laundry worker, messenger, Janitor, unskilled factory worker, farm helpers, parking lot attendant, window clearner, stock handler

5. SKILLED MANUAL EMPLOYEES. Examples: auto body repairer, carpenter, electrician, machinist, painter, plumber, policeman, postman, tailor, printer.

6. BUSINESS MANAGERS, PROPRIETORS OF MEDIUM SIZED BUSINESS, AND LESSER PROFESSIONALS. Examples: district manager, police chief, farm manager, postmaster, sales engineer, clothing store owner, real estate broker, theater owner, librarian, military commissioned officer, nurse, teacher, pharmacist, musician.

7. MACHINE OPERATORS AND SEMI-SKILLED EMPLOYEES. Examples: assembly line worker, bus driver, foundry worker, meat cutter, roofer, truck driver, welder, military enlisted person

8. HOUSEWIFE

9. UNEMPLOYED

10. UNKNOWN

11. OTHER

FORM A 12/20/64

ATDP SCALE

READ EACH STATEMENT AND PUT AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN ON THE ANSWER SHEET. DO NOT MAKE ANY MARKS ON THE QUESTION SHEETS.

PLEASE ANSWER EVERY QUESTION

---

1. Disabled people are often unfriendly.
2. Disabled people should not have to compete for jobs with physically normal persons.
3. Disabled people are more emotional than other people.
4. Most disabled persons are more self-conscious than other people.
5. We should expect just as much from disabled as from non-disabled persons.
6. Disabled workers cannot be as successful as other workers.
7. Disabled people usually do not make much of a contribution to society.
8. Most non-disabled people would not want to marry anyone who is physically disabled.
9. Disabled people show as much enthusiasm as other people.
10. Disabled persons are usually more sensitive than other people.
11. Severely disabled persons are usually untidy.
12. Most disabled people feel that they are as good as other people.
13. The driving test given to a disabled person should be more severe than the one given to the non-disabled.
14. Disabled people are usually sociable.
15. Disabled persons usually are not as conscientious as physically normal persons.
16. Severely disabled persons probably worry more about their health than those who have minor disabilities.
17. Most disabled persons are not dissatisfied with themselves.
18. There are more misfits among disabled persons than among non-disabled persons.

Yuker, H., Block, J. and Young, J. The measurement of attitudes toward the disabled person. Human Resources Center, Alberton, NY: 1970.

ATDP SCALE

19. Most disabled persons do not get discouraged easily.

20. Most disabled persons resent physically normal people.

21. Disabled children should compete with physically normal children.

22. Most disabled persons can take care of themselves.

23. It would be best if disabled persons would live and work with non-disabled persons.

24. Most severely disabled people are just as ambitious as physically normal persons.

25. Disabled people are just as self-confident as other people.

26. Most disabled persons want more affection and praise than other people.

27. Physically disabled persons are often less intelligent than non-disabled ones.

28. Most disabled persons are different from non-disabled people.

29. Disabled persons don't want any more sympathy than other people.

30. The way disabled people act is irritating.

ATDP - FORM A

CODE #_____ ATDP SCALE ANSWER SHEET
FORM A

Use this answer sheet to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the statements about disabled people on the attached list. Put an "X" trhough the appropriate number from +3 to -3 depending on how you feel in each case.

+3: I AGREE VERY MUCH
+2: I AGREE PRETTY MUCH
+1: I AGREE A LITTLE
-1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE
-2: I DISAGREE PRETTY MUCH
-3: IDISAGREE VERY MUCH

PLEASE ANSWER EVERY ITEM

(1)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(16)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(2)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(17)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(3)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(18)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(4)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(19)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(5)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(20)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(6)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(21)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(7)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(22)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(8)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(23)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(9)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(24)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(10)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(25)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(11)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(26)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(12)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(27)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(13)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(28)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(14)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(29)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(15)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(30)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3

Executive High School Internships of America
Mainstreaming Project
SEMINAR AND PROJECT CHECK LIST

NAME OF INTERN_____

DATE_____

RATER_____

Check whether _____coordinator
_____employer
_____faculty advisor

To the Rater: Please use this check list to assess whether the intern has covered each of the items below in the presentation. Check either "YES" or "NO" for each.

1-13. Presented an overview of the organization as follows:	YES	NO
1. Identified the priorities of the organization.		
2. Described how organization assesses its effectiveness in reaching goals.		
3. Demonstrated how priorities are reflected in operating budget.		
4. Described how decisions are made on budget.		
5. Presented organization chart and/or explained functions of major departments and key people.		
7. Explained and gave examples of difference between formal and informal organization.		
8. Presented example of how a major decision is made, including issues in dispute, those who influenced decision, how decision was ultimately reached, and next steps toward implementation.		
9. Described employer's scope of responsibility.		
10. Described characteristics of an effective executive or manager.		
11. Described constraints on employer's decision-making.		
12. Described strategies for changed used by employer.		

SEMINAR AND PROJECT CHECK LIST

	YES	NO
13-17. Presented a case study of a management problem, giving the following information:		
13. Definition of the problem.		
14. Cast of characters.		
15. Locus of decision-making power in the organization.		
16. Consequences for people in the organization if the problem is not solved.		
17. Time frame for solution.		
18-20. Presented an overview of career opportunities available in the organization:		
18. Types of positions that exsit or are anticipated--job descriptions.		
19. Requisite training and experience for various positions.		
20. Range of compensation.		
21. Entry-level positions and career ladder opportunities.		

Use this space for comments on overall presentation and suggestions for improvement.

Executive High School Internship of America

WORK HABITS PROFILE: Intern Self-Evaluation

NAME INTERN_____

EMPLOYER_____

COORDINATOR_____

DATE_____

To the Intern: Please rate your self on the extent to which you demonstrate each of the following work habits.

	HIGH		AVERAGE		LOW
1. Promptness--in arriving at appointments, in completing assignments, etc.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Appearance--appropirate dress and gromming for a particular activity.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Dependability--in meeting commitments.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Discretion--respecting confidentiality of situations.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Sensitivity--reacting effectively in new people.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Flexibility--reacting effectively in new and unanticipated situations.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Independence--ability to work with out constant supervision.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Accuracy-ability to follow directions, be attentive to details, obtain information and convey it correctly.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Maturity--seriousness in approach to assignments.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Creativity--ability to generate alternative solutions to problems.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Attitude--a positive outlook, a willingness to undertake tasks, including those that are unfamiliar or unpleasant.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Perseverance--pursuing goals despite temporary setback.	1	2	3	4	5

Executive High School Internships of America
Mainstreaming Project

Personal Performance Assessment

Name of Intern: _____

Date: _____

To the intern: On this form, please list at least 5 specific tasks which you will have to perform in your internship. Then, using the scale on the right, circle the number which best corresponds to your own assessment of your ability to perform each task.

Task	(1) unable to perform				(5) will perform excellently
1. _____	1	2	3	4	5
2. _____	1	2	3	4	5
3. _____	1	2	3	4	5
4. _____	1	2	3	4	5
5. _____	1	2	3	4	5
6. _____	1	2	3	4	5
7. _____	1	2	3	4	5
8. _____	1	2	3	4	5
9. _____	1	2	3	4	5
10. _____	1	2	3	4	5

Executive High School Internships of America

Mainstreaming Project

Ability, Interest and Skill Inventory

Name of Intern: _____

Date: _____

To the Intern: For each job listed below, please place checks in the appropriate columns if you think that you have ability, interest or skill in the job.

	Ability	Interest	Skill
1. bank teller			
2. lawyer			
3. newspaper reporter			
4. custodian			
5. carpenter			
6. real estate broker			
7. bus driver			
8. military commanding officer			
9. teacher			
10. store manager			

Executive High School Internship of America
Mainstreaming Project

End-of-Term Inventory (Intern Response)

NAME OF INTERN _____ DATE _____

To the Intern: For each item, circle the number that best fits your response. 1= very; 2= moderately; 3= somewhat; 4= not very; and 5= not applicable. If you have any further comments, please use the space provided at the end.

	very	moderately	somewhat	not very	not applicable
1. How satisfied were you with the program as a whole?	1	2	3	4	5
2. How satisfied were you with the placement provided by your specific employer?	1	2	3	4	5
3. How well did you understand the goals of the program at the beginning?	1	2	3	4	5
4. How well prepared were you for the employer interviews during the placement period?	1	2	3	4	5
5. How adequately did your coordinator help you agjust to the expectations of the placement?	1	2	3	4	5
6. How interesting were the weekly seminars?	1	2	3	4	5
7. How well planned were they?	1	2	3	4	5
8. How well did they relate to the issues you were facing in your placement?	1	2	3	4	5
9. How much did you benefit from preparing logs?	1	2	3	4	5
10. How useful was the coordinator's feedback on your logs?	1	2	3	4	5
11. How encouraging were teachers and counselors about entering the program?	1	2	3	4	5
12. How helpful was the school in providing independent study assistance?	1	2	3	4	5
13. How easy was it to maintain contacts with old friends back at school?	1	2	3	4	5
14. To make new friends in the program?	1	2	3	4	5

©Executive High School Internships of America. 1976. All rights reserved.

	very	moderately	somewhat	not very	not applicable
27. Strengthened ability to speak with confidence and maturity.	1	2	3	4	5
28. How receptive was your faculty advisor to your role as a teaching assistant?	1	2	3	4	5
29. Did you spend time back at school almost every Friday?	1	2	3	4	5
30. How often did you do research?	1	2	3	4	5
31. Prepare a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5
32. Teach a class?	1	2	3	4	5
33. Tutor other students?	1	2	3	4	5
34. Work on a school activity related to your internship?	1	2	3	4	5
35. Brief the faculty?	1	2	3	4	5
36. How valuable was the experience of presenting an end-of-term project?	1	2	3	4	5

Instructions: For Nos. 38-69, circle either "yes", or "no" or "N/A"(not applicable)

37. Did your employer include you in meetings?	yes	no	N/A
38. Were your opinions sought at meetings and other times?	yes	no	N/A
39. Did you prepare written memos, reports, or correspondence?	yes	no	N/A
40. Did you do research?	yes	no	N/A
41. Did you travel with the employer or staff to other parts of the community?	yes	no	N/A
42. Out of the community?	yes	no	N/A
43. Did you learn to read or analyze complicated materials?	yes	no	N/A

	very	moderately	somewhat	not very	not applicable
44. Did you learn to use the telephone for business purposes?	yes			no	N/A
45. Did you meet new people?	yes			no	N/A
46. Were there opportunities to meet privately with your employer and discuss what you were learning?	yes			no	N/A
47. Did you have lunch together?	yes			no	N/A
48. Did you spend less than 50% of your time with your employer?	yes			no	N/A
49. Did you visit other parts of the organization?	yes			no	N/A
50. Did you undertake any projects of your own?	yes			no	N/A
51. Did you serve mostly as a secretary, clerk, or messenger?	yes			no	N/A
52. Were you treated as part of the adult professional staff?	yes			no	N/A
53. Did you receive sufficient assistance from your employer and other staff members?	yes			no	N/A
54. Did your level of self-confidence increase?	yes			no	N/A
55. Did your employer or others advise on career opportunities?	yes			no	N/A
56. Did your employer or others advise on further education to pursue?	yes			no	N/A
57. Did your employer act as a reference for employment, college, or scholarship applications?	yes			no	N/A
58. Has the sponsoring agency offered you paid employment?	yes			no	N/A

	very	moderately	somewhat	not very	not applicable
15. How easy was it to obtain news about school activities, scholarship exams, yearbook pictures, etc?	1	2	3	4	5
16. How influential was the program in shaping your career goals?	1	2	3	4	5
17. How influential was the program in helping you make decisions on educational goals?	1	2	3	4	5
18. How helpful was the Memorandum of Understanding in negotiating credit?	1	2	3	4	5
19. In negotiating with the employer?	1	2	3	4	5
20. How well did you previous classroom training prepare you for the internship experience?	1	2	3	4	5
21. How accessible was the coordinator when you needed help or information?	1	2	3	4	5
22. How supportive have your parent(s) guardian(s) been of your participation in the program?	1	2	3	4	5
23-27. How well do you feel you have met each of the following performance objectives of the program:					
23. Became knowledgeable about how an organization functions.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Learned how decisions are made and carried out by executives and managers.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Developed sound work habits, such as appropriate appearance, dependability, discretion, interpersonal sensitivity, independence, accuracy, promptness, maturity, and positive attitude.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Strengthened ability to write fluently and concisely.	1	2	3	4	5

SPONSOR

FORM A 12/20/64

ATDP SCALE

READ EACH STATEMENT AND PUT AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN ON THE ANSWER SHEET. DO NOT MAKE ANY MARKS ON THE QUESTION SHEETS.

PLEASE ANSWER EVERY QUESTION

---

1. Disabled people are often unfriendly.
2. Disabled people should not have to compete for jobs with physically normal persons.
3. Disabled people are more emotional than other people.
4. Most disabled persons are more self-conscious than other people.
5. We should expect just as much from disabled as from non-disabled persons.
6. Disabled workers cannot be as successful as other workers.
7. Disabled people usually do not make much of a contribution to society.
8. Most non-disabled people would not want to marry anyone who is physically disabled.
9. Disabled people show as much enthusiasm as other people.
10. Disabled persons are usually more sensitive than other people.
11. Severely disabled persons are usually untidy.
12. Most disabled people feel that they are as good as other people.
13. The driving test given to a disabled person should be more severe than the one given to the non-disabled.
14. Disabled people are usually sociable.
15. Disabled persons usually are not as conscientious as physically normal persons.
16. Severely disabled persons probably worry more about their health than those who have minor disabilities.
17. Most disabled persons are not dissatisfied with themselves.
18. There are more misfits among disabled persons than among non-disabled persons.

Yuker, H., Block, J. and Young, J. The measurement of attitudes toward the disabled person. Human Resources Center, Alberton, NY: 1970.

ATDP SCALE

19. Most disabled persons do not get discouraged easily.

20. Most disabled persons resent physically normal people.

21. Disabled children should compete with physically normal children.

22. Most disabled persons can take care of themselves.

23. It would be best if disabled persons would live and work with non-disabled persons.

24. Most severely disabled people are just as ambitious as physically normal persons.

25. Disabled people are just as self-confident as other people.

26. Most disabled persons want more affection and praise than other people.

27. Physically disabled persons are often less intelligent than non-disabled ones.

28. Most disabled persons are different from non-disabled people.

29. Disabled persons don't want any more sympathy than other people.

30. The way disabled people act is irritating.

ATDP - FORM A

CODE #_____ ATDP SCALE ANSWER SHEET
FORM A

Use this answer sheet to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the statements about disabled people on the attached list. Put an "X" trhough the appropriate number from +3 to -3 depending on how you feel in each case.

+3: I AGREE VERY MUCH
+2: I AGREE PRETTY MUCH
+1: I AGREE A LITTLE
-1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE
-2: I DISAGREE PRETTY MUCH
-3: IDISAGREE VERY MUCH

PLEASE ANSWER EVERY ITEM

(1)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(16)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(2)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(17)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(3)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(18)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(4)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(19)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(5)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(20)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(6)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(21)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(7)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(22)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(8)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(23)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(9)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(24)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(10)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(25)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(11)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(26)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(12)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(27)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(13)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(28)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(14)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(29)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(15)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(30)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3

Executive High School Internships of America
Mainstreaming Project

Work Habits Profile

Name of Intern _____

Sponsor _____

Coordinator _____

Date _____

To the Sponsor: Please rate your intern on the extent to which each of the following work habits has been demonstrated.

	high		average		low
1. Promptness --in arriving at the internship, in completing assignments, etc.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Appearance -- appropriate dress and grooming.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Dependability --in meeting commitments.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Discretion -- respecting confidentiality of situations.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Sensitivity --relating well to a variety of people.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Flexibility --reacting to new and unanticipated situations.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Independence --ability to work without constant supervision.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Accuracy --ability to follow directions, attentive to details, able to obtain information and convey it accurately.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Maturity--seriousness in approach to internship.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Creativity--ability to generate alternative solutions to problems.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Attitude--a positive outlook on the assignment, a willingness to undertake tasks.	1	2	3	4	5

What specific improvements are needed in the intern's work habits? Please explain

To the Coordinator: Please rate the intern on the extent to which each of the above work habits are being demonstrated.

Executive High School Internships of America
Mainstreaming Project
SEMINAR AND PROJECT CHECK LIST

NAME OF INTERN _____

DATE _____

RATER _____

Check whether _____ coordinator
_____ employer
_____ faculty advisor

To the Rater: Please use this check list to assess whether the intern has covered each of the items below in the presentation. Check either "YES" or "NO" for each.

	YES	NO
1-13. Presented an overview of the organization as follows:		
1. Identified the priorities of the organization.		
2. Described how organization assesses its effectiveness in reaching goals.		
3. Demonstrated how priorities are reflected in operating budget.		
4. Described how decisions are made on budget.		
5. Presented organization chart and/or explained functions of major departments and key people.		
7. Explained and gave examples of difference between formal and informal organization.		
8. Presented example of how a major decision is made, including issues in dispute, those who influenced decision, how decision was ultimately reached, and next steps toward implementation.		
9. Described employer's scope of responsibility.		
10. Described characteristics of an effective executive or manager.		
11. Described constraints on employer's decision-making.		
12. Described strategies for changed used by employer.		

SEMINAR AND PROJECT CHECK LIST

	YES	NO
13-17. Presented a case study of a management problem, giving the following information:		
13. Definition of the problem.		
14. Cast of characters.		
15. Locus of decision-making power in the organization.		
16. Consequences for people in the organization if the problem is not solved.		
17. Time frame for solution.		
18-20. Presented an overview of career opportunities available in the organization:		
18. Types of positions that exsit or are anticipated--job descriptions.		
19. Requisite training and experience for various positions.		
20. Range of compensation.		
21. Entry-level positions and career ladder opportunities.		

Use this space for comments on overall presentation and suggestions for improvement.

Executive High School Internships of America
Mainstreaming Project

END-OF-TERM INVENTORY (Sponsor Response)

Name of Sponsor_____ Date_____

To the sponsor: For each item, circle the number that best fits your response. 1=very; 2=moderately; 3=somewhat; 4=not very; and 5=not applicable. If you have further comments, please use the space provided at the end.

	very	moderately	somewhat	not very	not applicable
1. How satisfied are you with the overall program?	1	2	3	4	5
2. How well did you understand the goals of the program?	1	2	3	4	5
3. How well was the placement process organized?	1	2	3	4	5
4. How well prepared was your intern for the experience?	1	2	3	4	5
5. How helpful was the coordinator in assisting the intern in making adjustments?	1	2	3	4	5
6. How accessible was the coordinator when you needed information or assistance?	1	2	3	4	5
7. How well suited was the intern to the needs and environment of your organization?	1	2	3	4	5
8. How useful was the Memorandum of Understanding	1	2	3	4	5
9.-13. How well do you feel the intern met each of the following performance objectives of the program:					
9. Became knowledgeable about how an organization functions.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Learned how decisions are made and carried out by executives and managers.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Developed sound work habits, such as appropriate appearance, dependability, discretion, interpersonal sensitivity, independence, accuracy, promptness, maturity, and positive attitudes.	1	2	3	4	5

© Executive High School Internships of America. 1976. All rights reserved.

END-OF-TERM INVENTORY

	very	moderately	somewhat	not very	not applicable
12. Strengthened ability to write fluently and precisely.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Strengthened ability to speak with confidence and maturity.	1	2	3	4	5
14. How useful is the program for educating students about the world of work in organizations?	1	2	3	4	5

Instructions: For Nos. 15-43, circle either "yes, "no", or "N/A" (not applicable).

15. Do you intend to continue as an employer next term?	yes	no	N/A
16. Did you include your intern in meetings?	yes	no	N/A
17. Did you seek the intern to prepare written memos, reports, or correspondence?	yes	no	N/A
18. Did you ask the intern to prepare written memos, reports, or correspondence?	yes	no	N/A
19. To do research?	yes	no	N/A
20. Did the intern travel with you to other parts of the community?	yes	no	N/A
21. Out of the community?	yes	no	N/A
22. Did the intern learn to analyze complicated materials?	yes	no	N/A
23. Did the intern learn to use the telephone for business purpose?	yes	no	N/A
24. Did the intern have an opportunity to meet new people?	yes	no	N/A
25. Did the intern have opportunity to meet privately with you and discuss what was being learned?	yes	no	N/A
26. Did the intern undertake any special projects?	yes	no	N/A
27. Was the intern treated as a member of your adult professional staff?	yes	no	N/A

END-OF-TERM INVENTORY

	very	moderately	somewhat	not very	not applicable
28. Was the intern used mostly as a secretary, clerk, or messenger?		yes		no	N/A
29. Was the intern of value to your organization?		yes		no	N/A
30. Did the intern attend lunch meetings with you?		yes		no	N/A
31. Did the intern become acquainted with new career opportunities?		yes		no	N/A
32. Did the intern gain new vocational skills and knowledge: (If so, please specify in space avaiable.)		yes		no	N/A
33. Did the intern's level of self-confidence and poise increase?		yes		no	N/A
34. Did the intern's communication and written skills improve?		yes		no	N/A
35. Did the intern present any special problems? (If so, use space available to elaborate.)		yes		no	N/A
36. Were those problems overcome?		yes		no	N/A
37. Did you advise the intern on future career?		yes		no	N/A
38. On further education?		yes		no	N/A
39. Did you receive at least three site visits from the coordinator during the term?		yes		no	N/A
40. Have you had contact with the intern's parent(s) or guardian(s)?		yes		no	N/A
41. Do you consider this important?		yes		no	N/A
42. If you had it to do over again, would you select the same intern?		yes		no	N/A
43. Do you intend to take another intern next semester?		yes		no	N/A

Use this space for additional comments.

COORDINATOR

Executive High School Internships of America
Mainstreaming Project

Special Education Information Scale

Coordinator _____

City _____

Date _____

1. If an individual loses consciousness momentarily, stares, and the eyelids twitch without convulsions, this is a strong indication of:

[] grand mal epilespy
[] petit mal epilepsy
[] Jacksonian epilepsy
[] psychomotor epilepsy

2. The most desireable educational program for orthopedically handicapped children is:

[] association with normal children only
[] participation in activities with handicapped and normal children
[] institutionalization to provide extensive physical therapy
[] association with handicapped children only

3. Spina bifida is:

[] a viral disease affecting the gray matter of the spinal chord
[] an anomaly resulting in the incomplete closure of the bony elements of the spine
[] another term for osteomyelitis
[] another term for curvature of the spine

4. Since educational provisions for the orthopedically handicapped are primarily for physical, medical, and health reasons, it follows that:

[] no real modification need be made in the regular classroom
[] curricula changes are extremely important
[] separate facilities are vital for the education of orthopedically handicapped children
[] the orthopedically handicapped can be educated in the regular classroom with necessary modification

5. The intellectually gifted child is not usually:

[] known to use common sense
[] interested in a wide range of things
[] above average in emotional development
[] original in his thinking

6. The essential difference between a deaf child and a hard-of-hearing child is:

[] a conductive hearing loss
[] the ability to acquire language
[] age of onset
[] special class placement

7. The only liberal arts college in the United States organized exclusively for the higher education of the deaf is:

[] Perkins Institute
[] Clarke School for the Deaf
[] Gallaudet
[] Rochester Institute of Technology

8. A youngster has a 30 decibel hearing loss at age 16 years. The factor that should influence the primary educational consideration is:

[] communication skills
[] age of onset
[] social adjustment
[] cause of deafness

9. Hard-of-hearing children are educated primarily through:

[] symbolic instruction
[] gestural instruction
[] the auditory channel
[] the visual channel

10. The greatest handicap incurred through loss of hearing is usually the:

[] inability to hear those talking to you
[] difficulty in acquiring speech and language
[] social stigma
[] lack of employment opportunities

11. The average Braille reading speed is:

[] 30 words per minute
[] 60 words per minute
[] 90 words per minute
[] 120 words per minute

12. The doctrine of "sensory compensation" stating that one sense becomes more acute when another is absent:

[] is applicable to the hearing of blind children
[] is applicable to the sight of deaf children
[] can be applied to both deaf and blind children as regards hearing and vision
[] cannot be demonstrated

13. The device used by the blind to communicate with the sighted through the printed word is the:

[] typewriter
[] Perkins Brailler
[] braille typewriter
[] braille writer

14. The technique used to speed up the transmission of audio signals with a minimum of distortion is called:

[] audio acceleration response
[] the talking book
[] compressed speech
[] the Lowenfeld method

15. Because the availability of brailled books is limited, the standard method of imparting educational information to the blind has become:

[] compressed speech
[] the use of "readers"
[] the "Talking Book"
[] the dictaphone method

List the resources available in your area for providing support services to gifted handicapped interns:

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

FORM A 12/20/64

ATDP SCALE

READ EACH STATEMENT AND PUT AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN ON THE ANSWER SHEET. DO NOT MAKE ANY MARKS ON THE QUESTION SHEETS.

PLEASE ANSWER EVERY QUESTION

---

1. Disabled people are often unfriendly.
2. Disabled people should not have to compete for jobs with physically normal persons.
3. Disabled people are more emotional than other people.
4. Most disabled persons are more self-conscious than other people.
5. We should expect just as much from disabled as from non-disabled persons.
6. Disabled workers cannot be as successful as other workers.
7. Disabled people usually do not make much of a contribution to society.
8. Most non-disabled people would not want to marry anyone who is physically disabled.
9. Disabled people show as much enthusiasm as other people.
10. Disabled persons are usually more sensitive than other people.
11. Severely disabled persons are usually untidy.
12. Most disabled people feel that they are as good as other people.
13. The driving test given to a disabled person should be more severe than the one given to the non-disabled.
14. Disabled people are usually sociable.
15. Disabled persons usually are not as conscientious as physically normal persons.
16. Severely disabled persons probably worry more about their health than those who have minor disabilities.
17. Most disabled persons are not dissatisfied with themselves.
18. There are more misfits among disabled persons than among non-disabled persons.

Yuker, H., Block, J. and Young, J. The measurement of attitudes toward the disabled person. Human Resources Center, Alberton, NY: 1970.

ATDP SCALE

19. Most disabled persons do not get discouraged easily.

20. Most disabled persons resent physically normal people.

21. Disabled children should compete with physically normal children.

22. Most disabled persons can take care of themselves.

23. It would be best if disabled persons would live and work with non-disabled persons.

24. Most severely disabled people are just as ambitious as physically normal persons.

25. Disabled people are just as self-confident as other people.

26. Most disabled persons want more affection and praise than other people.

27. Physically disabled persons are often less intelligent than non-disabled ones.

28. Most disabled persons are different from non-disabled people.

29. Disabled persons don't want any more sympathy than other people.

30. The way disabled people act is irritating.

ATDP - FORM A

CODE #_____ ATDP SCALE ANSWER SHEET
FORM A

Use this answer sheet to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the statements about disabled people on the attached list. Put an "X" trhough the appropriate number from +3 to -3 depending on how you feel in each case.

+3: I AGREE VERY MUCH
+2: I AGREE PRETTY MUCH
+1: I AGREE A LITTLE
-1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE
-2: I DISAGREE PRETTY MUCH
-3: IDISAGREE VERY MUCH

PLEASE ANSWER EVERY ITEM

(1)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(16)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(2)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(17)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(3)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(18)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(4)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(19)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(5)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(20)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(6)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(21)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(7)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(22)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(8)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(23)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(9)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(24)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(10)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(25)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(11)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(26)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(12)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(27)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(13)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(28)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(14)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(29)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
(15)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(30)	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3

Executive High School Internships of America
Mainstreaming Project

Work Habits Profile: Coordinator Evaluation

Name of Intern: _____

Sponsor: _____

Coordinator: _____

Date: _____

To the Coordinator:

The following is a list of behaviors from the Memorandum of Understanding. For each item, indicate how much change you believe has occurred in the interns behavior as a result of participating in the program.

Put a check(✓)in the appropriate blank.

	Change in Behavior				
	Great decrease	Moderate decrease	No Change	Moderate increase	Great increase
WORK HABITS					
a. Promptness--in arriving at the internship, in completing assignments, etc.	—	—	—	—	—
b. Appearance--appropriate dress and grooming	—	—	—	—	—
c. Dependability--in meeting commitments	—	—	—	—	—
d. Discretion--respecting confidentiality of situations	—	—	—	—	—
e. Sensitivity--relating well to a variety of people	—	—	—	—	—
f. Flexibility--reacting to new and unanticipated situations	—	—	—	—	—
g. Independence--ability to work without constant supervision	—	—	—	—	—

h.	Accuracy--ability to follow directions, be attentive to details, obtain information and convey it accurately	—	—	—	—	—
i.	Maturity--seriousness in approach to internship	—	—	—	—	—
j.	Creativity--ability to generate alternative solutions to problems	—	—	—	—	—
k.	Attitude--a positive outlook on the assignment, a willingness to undertake tasks	—	—	—	—	—

PERSONAL GROWTH

a.	awareness of own skills and abilities in relation to present and future goals	—	—	—	—	—
b.	sense of self confidence	—	—	—	—	—

COMMUNICATIONS SKILLS

a.	ability to write fluently and precisely	—	—	—	—	—
b.	ability to speak with confidence and maturity	—	—	—	—	—

Executive High School Internships of America
Mainstreaming Project
SEMINAR AND PROJECT CHECK LIST

NAME OF INTERN_____

DATE_____

RATER_____

Check whether _____coordinator
_____employer
_____faculty advisor

To the Rater: Please use this check list to assess whether the intern has covered each of the items below in the presentation. Check either "YES" or "NO" for each.

	YES	NO
1-13. Presented an overview of the organization as follows:		
1. Identified the priorities of the organization.		
2. Described how organization assesses its effectiveness in reaching goals.		
3. Demonstrated how priorities are reflected in operating budget.		
4. Described how decisions are made on budget.		
5. Presented organization chart and/or explained functions of major departments and key people.		
7. Explained and gave examples of difference between formal and informal organization.		
8. Presented example of how a major decision is made, including issues in dispute, those who influenced decision, how decision was ultimately reached, and next steps toward implementation.		
9. Described employer's scope of responsibility.		
10. Described characteristics of an effective executive or manager.		
11. Described constraints on employer's decision-making.		
12. Described strategies for changed used by employer.		

SEMINAR AND PROJECT CHECK LIST

	YES	NO
13-17. Presented a case study of a management problem, giving the following information:		
13. Definition of the problem.		
14. Cast of characters.		
15. Locus of decision-making power in the organization.		
16. Consequences for people in the organization if the problem is not solved.		
17. Time frame for solution.		
18-20. Presented an overview of career opportunities available in the organization:		
18. Types of positions that exsit or are anticipated--job descriptions.		
19. Requisite training and experience for various positions.		
20. Range of compensation.		
21. Entry-level positions and career ladder opportunities.		

Use this space for comments on overall presentation and suggestions for improvement

Executive High School Internships of America
Mainstreaming Gifted Handicapped Project
Plenary-Training Workshop (Oct. 27-29, 1977)

Conference Follow-up Questionnaire

Name _____ District _____

Date _____

For each item, circle the number that best fits your response.
1= strongly agree; 2= somewhat agree; 3= agree; 4= somewhat disagree; 5= strongly disagree; 6= no opinion. If you gave any further comments, please use the space provided at the end.

	strongly agree	somewhat agree	agree	somewhat disagree	strongly disagree	no opinion
The organization (i.e. meeting time schedule, physical plant, hand-outs) of the Plenary-Training Workshop facilitiated meeting the objectives of the conference.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Consensus was reached regarding learner objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Consensus was reached regarding process objectives (i.e. approach to career education for handicapped talented students).	1	2	3	4	5	6
Roles and responsibilities of local coordinators were clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Roles and responsibilities of sponsors were clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Roles and responsibilities of special education staff were clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Roles and responsibilities of local school administrators were clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Roles and resonsibilities of national office staff were clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5	6

	strongly agree	somewhat agree	agree	somewhat disagree	strongly disagree	no opinion
Roles and responsibilities of third party evaluators were clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Roles and responsibilities of the U.S.O.E. project officer were clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Consensus was reached on the criteria for selection of interns.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Consensus was reached on the criteria for sponsor selection.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Public relations responsibilities of the participants were specified.	1	2	3	4	5	6
A process for communication among national staff, coordinators and evaluators was established.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Discussions related to the special needs of handicapped interns were helpful.	1	2	3	4	5	6

List the principal objectives toward which the mainstreaming project is directed.

On the basis of the stated objectives do you feel that your district's program has any additional objectives which should be evaluated? If so please specify.

On the basis of increased knowledge of high school students with handicapping conditions, do you anticipate any special problems in implementing the project in your district? If so please specify.

Site Visit Guide

A. Coordinator

1. Description of mechanism for identifying eligible handicapped interns (selection criteria).

2. How does this mechanism differ from process used to identify and select non-handicapped interns.

3. What process was used to match sponsors with interns? Did process differ in case of handicapped?

4. What modification, if any, have been made to accommodate the handicapped interns?

   -at placement?
   -in seminar?
   -have special funds been needed?

5. Have there been special problems related to the handicap(s)? If so, what steps were taken toward solution?

   -contact with voluntary health agencies?
   -contact with school district special educators?

6. Comparison between performance of handicapped intern and that of non-handicapped peers.

7. How is information about the project disseminated?

8. Would you recommend continuation of mainstreaming component? Why? Why not? Modifications in process?

B. Representative of the School District

1. How does internship articulate with the on-going senior year requirements for program?

2. Do students contribute something special to home school as a result of the internship?

   -tutor others?
   -career counseling of peers?
   -development of related curriculum?
   -teaching assistant in related course?

3. Do handicapped students have IEP which includes goals and objectives for the internship?

4. Does school system have a plan for permanent installation of project?

5. Problems related to inclusion of handicapped as part of internship program.

C. Sponsor

1. Were you a sponsor in previous years?

2. Have you had any previous work with the handicapped?

3. Reason(s) for selecting handicapped intern or agreeing to sponsor one when asked?

4. Modifications necessary to accommodate handicapped?

5. Kind of support received from coordinator?

6. Desire to maintain an affiliation with the internship program (specifically would sponsor consider working with a handicapped intern in the future)?

7. Amount of time spent with intern each week?

8. Kinds of things intern is expected to do?

9. Response of other staff to handicapped intern?

10. How does performance of handicapped intern compare with overall performance of former non-handicapped interns?

D. Student Intern

1. Describe expectations for the internship.

2. Discuss existing and projected job opportunities in the field of the internship.

-job titles and descriptions
-requisite training and experience
-salary ranges
-opportunities for mobility.

3. Why did you chose this internship?

-describe previously formulated career goals,
-what is the affect of the internship on goals?

4. Describe previous mainstream experiences.

5. Talk about the term project.

6. Describe link with your home school.

7. Suggest changes for future interns.

8. Talk about your future plans.

E. Seminar Observations (Re: handicapped interns)

1. Ability to interact with peers on social level.

2. Demonstrated knowledge of course content (i.e., management techniques).

3. Ability to respond on par with peers.

4. Content of the seminar (general statement of focus).

Executive High School Internships of America
Mainstreaming Gifted Handicapped Project
Debriefing Conference (May 4, 1978)

Conference Follow-up Questionnaire

Name_____ District_____

Date_____

For each item, circle the number that best fits your response.
1= strongly agree; 2= somewhat agree; 3= agree; 4= somewhat disagree;
5= strongly disagree; 6= no opinion. If you gave any further comments,
please use the space provided at the end

	strongly agree	somewhat agree	agree	somewhat disagree	strongly disagree	no opinion
1. Meeting the objectives of the Debriefing Conference was facilitated by:						
a) meeting time and schedule	1	2	3	4	5	6
b) physical plant	1	2	3	4	5	6
c) transportation	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Interns were given ample opportunities to discuss their experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Interns were made to feel relaxed and therefore able to openly share their experiences with the group.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Interns brought with them and displayed samples of their work (e.g., logs, special projects, correspondence).	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Coordinators presented the steps taken to implement the project in his/her district.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. There was consensus as to what had constituted gifted for this project.	1	2	3	4	5	6

	strongly agree	somewhat agree	agree	somewhat disagree	strongly disagree	no opinion
7. There was consensus as to what had constituted handicapped for this project.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. There was consensus on appropriate criteria for selection of interns.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Problems involved in the actual implementation of this project were sufficiently discussed.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Positive results of this project were adequately presented.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Dissemination activities were adequately discussed by coordinators.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Reports at the Debriefing Conference are appropriate for use in developing an Adopter's Handbook.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Were you satisfied with the opportunities you had to discuss the project with other coordinators? Please explain the reasons for your answer.

Could you have profitted from this type of communication earlier in the semester? Why or why not?

Were the interns presentations effective in communicating the goals and activities of the project?

Were the internship experiences at the Kansas City meeting consistent with the goals of the project.